PAUL'S RHETORIC OF ARGUMENTATION IN I CORINTHIANS 1-4

A dissertation by

Raymond A. Humphries

presented to

The Faculty of the
Graduate Theological Union
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Berkeley, California
June 12, 1979

Committee Signatures

Hermann C. Waetjen
Chairman

Wilhelm Wuellner

Catherine Wise

UMI

To

Cindy, Robert and Natalie

PREFACE

The present study was begun under the supervision of Dieter Georgi of San Francisco Theological Seminary (now of Harvard University) and Herman Waetjen of San Francisco Theological Seminary. I am indebted to Professor Georgi for a renewed interest in Pauline Studies and in the social and cultural context of the New Testament documents. Professor Waetjen was a valued mentor during my doctoral studies. I am grateful to him for his support of my efforts to profit from advances in other disciplines in my study of the New Testament. He also graciously acted as chairman of my committee and made the oral defense of my dissertation a stimulating and enjoyable experience.

For my understanding of Modern Rhetorical Theory, I am indebted to Professors Thomas Conley and William J. Brandt of the Department of Rhetoric at the University of California at Berkeley. I greatly benefited from Dr. Conley's lectures on the history of rhetorical theory. I owe a special word of thanks to Dr. Brandt for his interest in my attempt to apply modern rhetorical criticism to Biblical material and for making himself available for discussion in the final stages of my work, even though he was on leave due to illness.

I was most fortunate to have as my thesis advisor, Professor Wilhelm Wuellner. I greatly profited from his

UMI

intimate knowledge of Pauline Studies and from his important contributions to the study of Paul's rhetoric. His probing questioning forced me to clarify my understanding of Rhetorical Criticism and to be consistent in its application to Biblical material. Dr. Wuellner's comments on the drafts submitted to him were judicious and helpful and greatly improved the final form of the dissertation.

A word of thanks is due to the Grants Committeee of Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland, for financial assistance, which enabled me to return to San Francisco to continue work on the dissertation. Thanks are also due to my colleagues in the Department of Religious Studies at Memorial, Professors Mackenzie and Hodder, for the helpful discussions on the value of Rhetorical Criticism in the study of the Pauline letters.

I am grateful to San Francisco Theological Seminary for readily making an offite available each time I returned to work on my dissertation. Thanks are also due to Mrs. Louise Beck, Librarian, who on many occasions, obtained material not available at San Anselmo.

Earlier drafts of this work were typed by Helen Rickert. For her patience in dealing with barely legible drafts and for reducing them to order, I am most grateful. The final draft was typed by my wife, Cindy. Her competence, and patience with a difficult manuscript, deserve my sincerest appreciation.

UMI

This work is didicated to my wife and children. I have depended on their patience and understanding for a long time. Now that the dissertation is complete their joy equals my own.

San Francisco Theological Seminary
San Anselmo, California
June 12, 1979

Raymond A. Humphries

UMI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE iii

ABBREVIATIONS viii

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION 1

Form Critical Study of the Pauline Letters 1
Rhetorical Criticism of the Pauline Letters . . . 5
The Plan of the Study 10
The Purpose of the Study 12

II RHETORICAL CRITICISM 22

The New Rhetoric 22
The Rhetorical Situation 29
Style and Structure 32
Audience 38
Argumentation 40

III THE TEXTUAL RHETORIC OF 1 CORINTHIANS 1-4 50

Textual Rhetoric 50
1:1-10 52
1:11-17 59
1:18-31 64
2:1-5 68
2:6-16 70
3:1-4 78
3:5-17 81
3:18-23 86
4:1-5 88
4:6-13 90
4:14-21 95
Results 97

IV THE STRUCTURAL RHETORIC OF 1 CORINTHIANS 1-4 . . . 105

Structural Rhetoric 105
Comparison of Exordium and Peroration 106
Epideictic Rhetoric 109

UMI

Narratio 119
Confirmatio 120
Peroration 126
Results 128

V CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS 132

BIBLIOGRAPHY 142

ABBREVIATIONS

ABR	Australian Biblical Review
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CQ	Crozier Quarterly
CR	Classical Review
ET	Expository Times
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JHI	Journal of the History of Ideas
JR	Journal of Religion
INT	Interpretation
NT	Novum Testamentum
NTS	New Testament Studies
PMLA	Publications of the Modern Language Association
PR	Philosophy and Rhetoric
QJS	Quarterly Journal of Speech
RSV	Revised Standard Version of the Bible
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Form Critical Study of the Pauline Letters

A new impetus was given to research on the Pauline letters by Robert Funk's proposal to apply the insights and techniques developed in the form critical studies on the synoptic gospels to the study of the form and function of the Pauline letter.[1]

The comparative material basic to form critical research had, of course, been available for over fifty years in the collection of papyrus letters and inscriptions of the Graeco-Roman period, and had been exploited in the study of the epistolary material in the New Testament by Deissmann,[2] Exler,[3] Meechan,[4] and Schubert.[5]

The formal study of the Pauline letter had not, however, outgrown the experimental stage when Funk was writing--Schubert's work providing a significant exception. This was due in part to the influence of Deissmann, a pioneer in the publication and interpretation of newly discovered papyrus letters. He was convinced that Paul's letters were to be understood in the light of the language, style and form of the common Greek letter. In characteristically enthusiastic fashion, he writes:

> I can well imagine that some readers will be astonished to hear me say that these poor scraps of papyrus, or potsherds inscribed with fragments of letter from unknown Egyptians, have taught me to understand the true nature of St. Paul's Epistles and, ultimately, the course by which primitive christianity developed on the literary side.[6]

Exaggerating the similarities between the private papyrus letters and those of Paul, he concluded that he had found the genus, of which the Pauline letter was a species. This belief led him to introduce his celebrated distinction between a letter and an epistle. For him, Paul's writings were letters and not epistles; they were communications dashed off in the midst of a busy life, "without any careful arrangement, unconstrainedly passing from one thing to the other, often indeed jumping."[7] Although Deissmann's distinction was rejected or modified by many of his contemporaries,[8] his influence was strong enough to cause interest to wane in the comparison between the form of the papyrus letter and the letters of Paul.[9]

Schubert set out to remedy the false start made by Deissmann and to apply form criticism to the investigation of the Pauline letters. He was careful to locate himself in the tradition of literary research exemplified in the work of Heinrici, Weiss, Norden, and Bultmann. His intention was to combine their researches with the gains of *Formgeschichte* and papyrological study in the service of "a more adequate and broader method of literary style criticism."[10]

What Schubert accomplished in his study on the Pauline

Thanksgiving, Funk hoped to see extended to the other parts of the letter and to the letter as a whole, with analysis of form being supplemented by style and sequence analysis.[11] His essay stimulated a series of studies that attempted to isolate the structure of major sections of the Pauline letter through a comparative study of the papyrus letters.

In his bibliographic essay on New Testament epistolary research, William Doty writes approvingly of Funk, White, Mullins, Sanders and others who used the Greek non-literary papyri letters in their work on the Pauline letters.[12] Doty, however, expresses surprise that so little attention had been paid to the body with respect to its formal elements. Significantly, this is the area in which Funk had hoped that advances might be made.[13]

It is precisely on this point that form critics have come to realize the limitations of the method. Papyrus models have thrown light on the conventions of the Opening and Closing of letters and on typical epistolary vocabulary, but they have been unable to account for the variations in the structure of the body of the letter or for the difference in the structure of the letters in the Pauline corpus.

Funk, for example, after indicating what he believes to be the substructure of the letter, emphasizes that Paul is creating his own letter form rather than following an established pattern: "It is just the way he writes letters."[14] John White argues that formulas are useful in revealing the

UMI

internal logic of a letter, but concedes that "the meaning of a formula in any specific instance must be determined on the internal contours of the letter itself."[15]

In his study of the body of the letter White had hoped to assess the relation of the parts of the body to each other and the import of the respective parts to the whole. But he is led to conclude, for example, with respect to 1 Thessalonians, that "the nature of the epistolary situation was determinative for the structural peculiarity."[16]

In a review of the more recent work of the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar on the letters of Paul, James D. Hester pointed out that interest focused less on form critical analysis of the parts of the letters than on the letter as a whole, and on the relation between the type of letter and the situation that produced it.[17]

The basic weakness of earlier efforts to interpret the Pauline letter through form critical categories was the failure to relate these findings to the particular purpose that prompted each letter. Such studies do provide valuable information on how Paul writes letters, his modes of argument, and his exegetical practices, but they are less than helpful in accounting for the structural and stylistic peculiarities of each individual letter. What is missing is an adequate discussion of the influence the author's awareness of his audience has on the selection of the structure and style of the discourse.[18]

UMI

The motivation for this study was the realization that the structure of the Pauline letters was responsive to the dynamics of the situation that produced them and that the generic constraints of the Greek common of literary letter were subordinate to the demands of the argumentation.[19]

What the term "situation" implies will be explained more fully in chapter one, but its essential component is the triad of writer, letter, recipient, expressed in rhetorical terms as speaker, argumentation, audience.

The methodology to be applied in the study is that of modern rhetorical analysis, a mode of analysis in which structure and style are considered in relation to their persuasive function and therefore cannot be interpreted apart from the author of the discourse and the audience to whom it is addressed.

The idea of interpreting the biblical text using insights derived from the study of rhetoric is not new. It is therefore appropriate to note these studies and to indicate in what respects they differ from the mode of rhetorical criticism employed in this study.

Rhetorical Criticism of the Pauline Letters

Johannes Weiss, a contemporary of Deissmann, called for a comprehensive study of Pauline rhetoric.[20] For him sound exegesis of the letters demanded an appreciation of the Greek and Hebrew rhetorical traditions to which Paul was indebted. In particular, he drew attention to the oral nature

of Paul's style, his mode of argumentation, and his extensive use of *parallelismus membrorum*. Weiss, however, realized that his essay was only a beginning, since he did not have the mastery of the Hellenistic models that he deemed essential for a definitive statement on Pauline rhetoric.[21]

In subsequent studies, Weiss continued to insist on the need for further studies on the oral dimension of Paul's style and on the significance of the extended parallelistic structures he detected in the letter, especially in Romans and 1 Corinthians.[22]

Following the direction indicated by Weiss, Bultmann investigated the influence of the style and method of argumentation of Cynic-Stoic diatribe on Paul's style of preaching, as it is reflected in the dialogic passages in the letters.[23] In the same vein was Thyen's dissertation on the style of the Jewish homily.[24] Also important is Bonsirven's study of the influence on Paul of Rabbinic methods of exegesis.[25]

While normally regarded as a form critic, Schubert shared with Weiss a sensitivity to the rhetorical dimension of the biblical text, and anticipates modern rhetorical theory on the relationship between structure and audience. In summarizing his findings on the nature of the Pauline Thanksgiving, he writes:

UMI

> The Pauline thanksgivings do have a definite addressee. This addressee is a structurally characteristic trait of the thanksgivings. The addressee in consistently referred to in personal objects, mostly in the dative of the second person of the personal pronoun, or, less frequently, in vocatives, ἀδελφοί or αδελφοι ἀγαπητοί, etc.... In other words, the thanksgiving is characterized by a basic polarity, a double focus around which all thoughts centre: the addressant and the addressee.[26]

He understands the structure of the thanksgivings as the direct expression of the epistolary (rhetorical) situation. And what he argued with respect to the Thanksgiving may be profitably applied to the other parts of the Pauline letter.

A concern to draw attention to the rhetorical features of New Testament literature is the distinguishing feature of John Paul Pritchard's *A Literary Approach to the New Testament*. Acknowledging his debt to Lane Cooper and Harry Caplan, classical scholars prominent in the revival of rhetoric as a critical discipline, he characterized the books of the New Testament as "rhetorical treatises in propaganda."[27]

Pritchard, however, limits himself to supplementing his discussion of the historical issues with observations on Paul's use of figures, after the fashion of Bengel.[28] Typical are his comments on Galatians and on 11 Corinthians 6:4-7:

> The literary devices in Galatians clearly reflect his emotional state. He uses thirteen rhetorical questions as opposed to one-third as many in the preceding letter to the Thessalonians.[29]
>
> Chapter 6, verses 4-7 provide a remarkable example of anaphora; eighteen prepositional phrases introduced by the preposition "in" strung loosely in asyndeton...

> This effect he follows (vv. 8-10) with another device which Coleridge was later to label the reconciliation of opposites. Here the opposites are paired in what amounts to an extended oxymoron presented in asyndeton. The value Longinus attached to combined figures is seldom better illustrated.[30]

Pritchard's work is symptomatic of a growing dissatisfaction with New Testament "introductions" and commentaries[31] that are dominated by the historical critical approach, with its penchant for comparative study of the literary forms and religious ideas of the biblical documents. Despite its limitations, his work introduces a necessary corrective by insisting that the documents of the New Testament were directed to specific audiences and were designed to produce changes in their thinking and behaviour. They represent, to use Kenneth Burke's definition of rhetoric, "the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions on other agents."[32]

Much more promising in this respect are the more recent papers by H. D. Betz on Galatians[33] and Wilhelm Wuellner on Romans,[34] which employ a more carefully articulated rhetorical methodology.

Betz, however, is too concerned to identify the precise rhetorical tradition to which Paul is indebted. Wuellner, however, uses methods of analysis not confined to the prescriptive rhetoric of a particular school or era, but applicable to a wide range of literature from different periods.

This renewed interest in rhetoric as an exegetical

tool has coincided with, and has been influenced by , the development in other disciplines of rhetoric as a critical discipline, with impressive achievements in classical, medieval, and modern literature.[35] It presents biblical scholars with an opportunity to bring to bear a mode of criticism that can explore creatively the speaker-audience relationship that form critics were apt to ignore.

The distinguishing feature of modern rhetorical theory has been its emphasis on the argumentative dimension of rhetoric.[36] Most biblical exegesis since the Renaissance has, however, been dominated by a conception of rhetoric as "style". This theory of rhetoric held that discussion of structure belonged to the province of logic, while rhetoric was thought of as the branch of study devoted to matters of style. The historical reasons for the divorce between argument (the traditional *inventio* and *dispositio)* will be dealt with in chapter two, but it is sufficient to note at this point that it was this narrow definition of rhetoric that hampered earlier efforts to produce the definitive Pauline rhetoric that Weiss envisaged.[37]

The value, then, of using modern rhetorical criticism in the interpretation of Paul's letters is that it offers a method of assessing the function of their stylistic and structural features in relation to the particular purpose of the letter in question.

UMI

The Plan of the Study

The text selected for this study is the first four chapters of 1 Corinthians. It shall be assumed, for the present that these chapters form a unified argumentative unit within the letter as a whole. A particular problem, or set of problems, is introduced, discussed, and brought to a resolution.[38]

The third chapter will be devoted to an analysis of the textual rhetoric of these chapters.[39] Textual rhetoric, as distinct from structural rhetoric, which is the subject of the fourth chapter, is concerned with the argumentative significance of the figurative language introduced by a writer in the process of communicating his ideas. The recognition of these departures from normal usage, whether semantic (*tropes*), syntactic (*schemes*), or pragmatic (*figures of thought*)[40] offers insight into the persuasive strategies operating at the level of sentence and paragraph.

In order to facilitate this mode of analysis the text will be arranged colometrically.[41] This procedure is of value in displaying the development of the argument in each section. It is also of service in drawing attention to the presence of various structuring devices such as *inclusio*, chiasmus, and larger parallelistic constructions.[42]

Following the practice of Professor Brandt,[43] attention will be drawn in the margin to rhetorical features in the text. These notations will then form the basis for the discussion of the textual rhetoric.

UMI

Textual and structural analysis are, of course, complementary and overlapping activities. Both are concerned with revealing the interaction of speaker and audience in the discourse. The problems of the manipulation of language to persuade in the smaller units of the discourse mirror those the speaker faces in the overall argument. Nevertheless, for purposes of analysis, the distinction is real and valuable.

In traditional rhetorical theory the discovery of arguments (*inventio*) and the arrangement of the material in the speech (*dispositio*) were logically and chronologically prior to the expression of these ideas in suitable language (*elocutio*). Thus the conscious and often unconscious manipulation of language to persuade may be distinguished from the overall organization of the speech, but the findings at one level supplement those at the other.

From the point of view of the audience of a speech, or for our purposes the members of a congregation listening to the reading of a letter from Paul (1 Thess. 5:26), the language of the letter makes an immediate impression. As the reading proceeds, his audience becomes aware of the form of the communication either by anticipation or reflection.

As already indicated, chapter four will deal with the structural rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 1-4. This involves the determination of the question at issue and a decision about the rhetorical genre in which Paul is working, for, as will be shown in chapter two, each genre, deliberative, forensic,

UMI

or epideictic, has its own goals and methods of argument. Having determined the genre, the analysis will trace the course of the discussion, beginning with the *exordium* and moving through the body of the argument to the *peroration*.

The fifth chapter will summarize the conclusions of the study and will discuss the relationship of chapters 1-4 to the rest of the letter.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is not to locate the rhetorical tradition to which Paul was indebted. Nor is it to discuss Paul's understanding of the rhetorical process, except insofar as it relates to the argument in 1 Cor. 1-4.

This is not to deny the legitimacy of research into the style of oratory prevailing in the first century.[45] The determination of the relationship between the Jewish homily or the Cynic-Stoic diatribe and the mode of argumentation in Paul's letters may offer assistance in detailing the options available to Paul as he composed his letters.

It is also desirable to arrive at an understanding of Paul's metarhetoric,[46] the presuppositions that underpin his conception of the role of the preacher in eliciting and maintaining faith in his hearers.[47] This is especially important in the light of the susceptibility of the Corinthians to the competing rhetorics of the "super-apostles" (11 Cor. 12:11).

The intention of the study is, however, to apply the techniques of rhetorical analysis that are not tied to the

rhetorical traditions of the speakers or hearers, but which can, nevertheless, describe the interaction between Paul and his audience, and in this way make a contribution to an understanding of Paul's rhetoric of argumentation.

The thesis that will be argued is that the structure of 1 Corinthians 1-4 derives from the strategy that Paul adopts to persuade the Corinthians that the solution to the problem of disunity within the congregation (1:10) was to accept him as a paradigmatic figure (4:16). A corollary of this will also be argued: the primary determinant of the structure of 1 Corinthians 1-4 was the requirements of the argumentation and not the structure of the Greek common or literary letter.

The value of the investigation lies in the mode of analysis it adopts and demonstrates and the clarification it offers on the use of rhetoric in the interpretation of the Pauline letters.

Previous studies that claimed to deal with Paul's rhetoric were limited in several ways. They operated with a narrow definition of rhetoric that directed attention to diction, figures of speech, and sentence structure. Also, the focus of these observations was on the literary evaluation of Paul as a writer and not on the persuasive function of the language employed. Consequently, matters of structure and modes of argumentation were considered separately and were examined in relation to questions of genre and logic.

Rhetorical criticism, however, is a mode of analysis

that looks at the interaction of the author and audience as it is reflected in the text and assesses the persuasive function of style, structure, and methods of argumentation the author has chosen to achieve his purposes.

The basic premise of this study is that a speaker or writer is operating rhetorically if he has the desire and the opportunity to persuade an audience, whether his skill derives from natural ability, imitation, or an extensive schooling in a particular rhetorical tradition.[48]

To limit the title "rhetorician" to the graduates of a particular rhetorical school reveals more about the sociological presuppositions of the critic than about the realities of communication in the first or twentieth century.

Equally irrelevant is the distinction between popular and literary material. Any document, with persuasive intent, whether it be a religious tract, a petition to a state official, or a speech delivered before an emperor, may be analyzed rhetorically.[49]

This is not to contend that the search for the precise rhetorical tradition to which Paul was indebted is either illegitimate or unprofitable. The history of rhetoric shows that different styles of speech predominate in different cultures and eras. Nevertheless, attempts to appreciate Paul's rhetoric need not be postponed until he has been precisely located in a particular tradition. Modern rhetorical criticism, benefiting from a body of knowledge about the use of

language to persuade, stretching from Aristotle to Perelman, can with profit be applied to a wide variety of texts from different periods.

UMI

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1. See Robert Funk's chapter, "The Letter: Form and Style," in his *Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), pp. 250-74

2. Adolf Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. Alexander Grieve (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901); *New Light on the New Testament from Records of the Graeco-Roman Period*, trans. L. R. M. Strachan (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908); *The New Testament in the Light of Modern Research* Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1929); and *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*, trans. W. E. Wilson (Torchbook ed.: New York: Harper & Bros., 1957).

3. F. X. J. Exler, *The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter: Study in Greek Epistolography* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America, 1923).

4. Henry G. Meechan, *Light from Ancient Letters* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1923).

5. Paul Schubert, *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings* (Berlin: Topelman, 1939).

6. Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910), p. 143, cited by Paul Schubert, "Form and Function of the Pauline Letters," *JR* 19 (October 1939): 368-9.

7. Deissmann, *Paul*, p. 12.

8. Schubert, "Pauline Letters," p. 369, quotes Paul Wendland: "Aber die Grenzlinie zwichen echtem Brief und literarischen Epistel darf nicht zu scharf gezogen wenden." Johannes Weiss, "Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik" in *Theologische Studien für Bernard Weiss* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897) p. 210, n.1, remarks that the distinction should be taken "cum grano salis." Schubert also refers to "Deissmann's influential pet theory" in *Pauline Thanksgivings*, p. 182, n.1. For evidence that the theory is still influential in Pauline studies, see the essays of Karris and Donfried in *The Romans Debate*, ed. Karl P. Donfried (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1977). William G. Doty, "The Classification of Epistolary Literature," *CBQ* 31 (April 1969): 183-199, discusses the presuppositions that prompt the series of oppositions in Deissmann's work: theology--religion, literary--nonliterary, public--private, form as the creation of art--fragment of life, epistle--letter.

9. Schubert, "Pauline Letters," pp. 370-71, finds only four significant studies that use the Hellenistic material in the examination of the formal aspects of the Pauline letter: O. Roller, *Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe: Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom Antiken Briefe* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933); L. G. Champion, *Benedictions and Doxologies in the Epistles of Paul* (Oxford: Kemp Hall Press, 1934); G. H. Boobyer, *Thanksgiving and the "Glory of God" in Paul* (Leipzig, 1929); and E. von Dobschütz "Zum Wortschatz und Stil des Römerbriefs," *ZNW* 33 (1934): 51-66.

10. Schubert, *Pauline Thanksgivings*, p. 10.

11. Funk, "The Letter," p. 264.

12. William G. Doty, *Letters in Primitive Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973), chapter two.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 34.

14. Funk, "The Letter," p. 270.

15. John Lee White, "The Structural Analysis of Philemon: A Point of Departure in the Formal Analysis of the Pauline Letter," *SBL 1971 Proceedings*, vol. 1, p. 25.

16. John Lee White, "*The Form and Function of the Body of the Greek Letter: SBL Dissertation Series, No. 2* (Missoula, Montana: SBL, 1972), p. 1 and p. 116, no. 62.

17. James D. Hester, "Epistolography in Antiquity and Early Christianity: A Proposal for Pacific Coast Region, *SBL* Seminar, 1975."). (Mimeographed.)

18. It is significant that in a volume devoted to the use of form criticism in Old Testament research, *Old Testament Form Criticism*, John H. Hayes, ed. (San Antonio: Trinity Univ. Press, 1974), the index contains no reference to "audience." However, reference is made in this work (p. 90) to James Muilenburg's address to the Society of Biblical Literature (*JBL* 88 (1969): 1-18) in which he pointed out the limitations of the form critical approach: "Form Criticism by its very nature is bound to generalize because it is concerned with what is common to all the representatives of the genre, and therefore applies an external measure to the individual pericope." Muilenburg realized that there was need to do justice to the particularities of the text being studied and advocated a mode of criticism that would include consideration of style, structure, and audience: "such an enterprise I should describe as rhetoric and the methodology as rhetorical criticism. "Form Criticism and Beyond," p. 8.

UMI

19. For a discussion of the false options in the study of Romans 9-11 introduced by form and genre comparisons, see Wilhelm Wuellner, "Paul; Rhetoric of Argumentation: An Alternative to the Donfried-Karris Debate over Romans," in *The Romans Debate*, pp. 152-174.

20. Weiss, "Beiträge," p. 165, regarded his work as only a beginning, and confined himself to gathering material for a comprehensive Pauline rhetoric.

21. *Ibid.*, "For the man who does not have the requisite mastery of Hellenistic literature the overall judgment must be held 'in suspenso.'"

22. See, for example, *Die Aufgaben der Neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft in der Gegenwart* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1908), pp. 16-21, and the chapters on Paul as a writer and theological thinker in *Earliest Christianity*, 2 vols., trans. Frederick C. Grant (Torchbook edition; New York: Harper Bros., 1959), vol. 2, pp. 399-445.

23. Rudolf Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.

24. Hartwig Thyen, *Der Stil der Judisch-Hellenistischen Homilie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955).

25. J. Bonsirven, *Exegese rabbinique et Exegese paulinienne* (Paris, 1939). For recent work on Paul's exegetical techniques and modes of argumentation, see J. Jeremias "Chiasmus in den Paulusbriefen," *ZNW* 49 (1958): 145-156, and "Zur Gedankenführung in paulinischen Briefen," in *Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwann* (Haarlem, 1953), pp. 146-154; both now reprinted in *Abba* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), pp. 269-290; Wilhelm Wuellner, "Haggadic Homily Genre in 1 Cor. 1-3," *JBL* 89 (June 1970): 199-204; Earl Ellis, "Exegetical Patterns in 1 Corinthians and Romans," in *Grace Upon Grace: Essays in Honor of Lester J. Kupyer*, ed. James I. Cook (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), pp. 137-142; Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (London: S P C K, 1974).

26. Schubert, *Pauline Thanksgivings*, p. 37.

27. John Paul Pritchard, *A Literary Approach to the New Testament* (Norman: Univ. of Oklahoma, 1972), p. 6.

28. John Albert Bengel, *Gnomon of the New Testament*, 3 vols. 7th ed. trans. Rev. Andrew R. Fausset et al., rev. and ed. Rev. Andrew R. Fausset (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1867-1877). A convenient index of the figures noted by Bengel is contained in vol. 3, pp. 391-428.

29. Pritchard, *Literary Approach*, p. 228

30. *Ibid.*, p. 241

31. For a discussion of the "commentary" genre, see *Colloquy 31: The Commentary Hermeneutically Considered* (Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1977).

32. Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1969; original edition 1950), p. 41.

33. H. D. Betz, "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians," *NTS* 21 (1975): 353-379.

34. Wuellner, "Paul's Rhetoric," in *The Romans Debate*, pp. 152-174, and "Digressions in 1 Corinthians and Their Rhetorical Functions," in *Festschrift for Robert Grant*, ed., R. L. Wilken (Paris: Beauchesne, 1980).

35. For a useful bibliography of examples of rhetorical criticism, see Edward P. J. Corbett, ed., *Rhetorical Analyses of Literary Works* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969), pp. 233-272.

36. See William J. Brandt, *The Rhetoric of Argumentation* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970), and Chaim Perelman and L. Olbrecht-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*, trans. John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver (Notre Dame: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1969), hereafter cited as Perelman, *New Rhetoric*). Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, p. 1, writes: "The publication of a treatise devoted to argumentation and this subject's connection with the ancient tradition of Greek rhetoric and dialectic constitutes a *break with a concept of reason and reasoning due to Descartes* which has set its mark on Western philosophy for the last three centuries."

37. William J. Doty, *Pauline Letters*, p. 41, agrees that rhetorical criticism is no longer restricted to the study of tropes and figures and concedes that "it may be understood as treating structure as well." But he criticizes David Greenwood, "Rhetorical Criticism and Formgeschichte: Some Methodological Considerations," *JBL* 89 (1970): 418-426, who "stresses structural analysis as constitutive of rhetorical criticism to a greater extent than I think necessary."

38. For a review of studies devoted to these chapters by Baur, Munck and others, see Nils Alstrup Dahl, "Paul and the Church at Corinth According to 1 Corinthians 1:10-4:21," in his *Studies in Paul* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977), pp. 40-61.

39. For a discussion of the function of an analysis of textual rhetoric, see Brandt, *Rhetoric*, pp. 93-116.

40. For the distinction, see Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, p. 168, and Quintilian, *Institut. Orat.* 9. 1.15-17.

41. Schubert, who employed this method to exhibit the structure of the Pauline Thanksgivings, refers in *Pauline Thanksgivings*, (p. 12, n. 1) to the article by Roland Schütz. "Die Bedeutung der Kolometrie für das Neue Testament," *ZNW* 21 (1922): 161-184, which cites the Suidas definition: κῶλον οὖν ὁ ἀπηρτισμένην ἔννοιαν ἔχων στίχος. More examples of the colometric arrangement of text are found in Schütz' earlier work, *Die parallele Bau der Satzglieder im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1920). For Augustine's employment of this method, see his exposition of 2 Corinthians 11:16-30 in *St. Augustine: On Christian Doctrine*, 4. 7. 12, as set out in Greek in E. A. Judge, "Paul's Boasting in Relation to Contemporary Professional Practice," *ABR* 16 (1968): 37-50, based on the translation by D. W. Robertson, Jr., *St. Augustine: On Christian Doctrine* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1958). For a recent application of the method to epistolary material, see B. L. Hijmans, Jr., *Inlaboratus et Facilis: Aspects of Structure in Some Letters of Seneca* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976).

42. For a discussion of the terminology and examples of this method of analysis, see Kenneth E. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), pp. 44-75.

43. For a textual analysis on these lines, see Brandt, *Rhetoric*, pp. 172-197.

44. For a discussion of the "reactions occasioned in the audience by its perception of the order or arrangement adopted in the speech," see Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, pp. 491-508.

45. E. A. Judge, "St. Paul and Classical Society," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 15 (1972): 19-36. See also the survey of recent research on the literary culture of the first century by Abraham H. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1977), pp. 55-59.

46. For a discussion of the term, see James J. Murphy, "The Metarhetorics of Plato, Augustine and McLuhan: A Pointing Essay," *PR* 4 (1971): 201-214.

47. For an interesting study of Paul's understanding of the function of human reason (the "logos" element) in preaching, see Dieter Werner Kemmler, *Faith and Human Reason: A Study of Paul's Method of Preaching as Illustrated by 1-2 Thessalonians*

and Acts 2-4 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975).

48. The point is well made by Paul Pritchard, *A Literary Approach to the New Testament*, pp. 10-11: "To speak of New Testament writers as rhetoricians is not to claim for them highly specialized training in the art. Rhetoric was . . . the art most profoundly affecting the lives of Mediterranean peoples. It related directly to everyday conversations, to business, to litigation, to politics and to religion. In such areas a man needed to know how to persuade others to his way of thinking and believing. . . . But to learn the practical uses of rhetoric, a man did not need to resort to instruction on higher levels. The *Satyricon* of Petronius and the satires of Persius and Juvenal indicate that Rome in the first century A. D. harboured hordes of teachers who blasted the ears of the people in the streets with samples of their wares in order to attract pupils. Even without taking their courses of instruction, a man could readily pick up fragments of that learning."

49. An example of a rhetorical analysis instructive for biblical scholars is the study of the language of the letters of the Hellenistic kings by C. Welles Bradford, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1934). With regard to the language employed, he writes: "Their rhetoric is not the rhetoric of an historian with literary pretensions but the cultured speech of the educated class, adapted to the epistolary form."

UMI

CHAPTER II

RHETORICAL CRITICISM

The New Rhetoric

The revival of interest in Rhetoric in America as an academic discipline has been traced to a group of scholars who in 1914 separated themselves from teachers of English and from instructors in elocution in order to redevelop the principles, practice, and theory of oral discourse.[1]

In the decades that followed this group and those who joined them attempted to recover "the whole art of discourse--the inventional and argumentative rhetoric of Aristotle and Cicero."[2] Specialists in ancient and medieval rhetoric such as Charles S. Baldwin, Harry Caplan, Lane Cooper, Everett Lee Hunt and Richard McKeon assisted in the remastery of the Western inheritance of rhetorical theory and practice and demonstrated the importance of a knowledge of rhetoric for the interpretation of medieval and renaissance literature.[3]

With the establishment of Departments of Rhetoric at many of the major universities in the late fifties, the revived discipline moved beyond its earlier concern with the Graeco-Roman, medieval, and Renaissance periods and devoted attention to the analysis of various modes of verbal communication such as essays, modern poetry, and novels.[4]

A clear indication of the vitality of the discipline

was its willingness to benefit from insights from fields as diverse as psychology, anthropology, semantics and philosophy. The result of this interaction can best be examined in the "new rhetorics" of I. A. Richards,[5] Kenneth Burke,[6] and Chaim Perelman.[7]

A convenient assessment of the important developments in the field is Donald C. Bryant's 1973 essay on the function and scope of rhetoric, which is a restatement and modification in the light of subsequent developments of an essay written twenty years earlier.[8]

He reaffirms his earlier identification of the four-fold role of rhetoric as an instrumental, critical, philosophical, and social discipline.[9] But he amends his previous definition of rhetoric as the "adjusting of ideas to people and people to ideas," to include action as well as ideas.[10] He also stresses that rhetorical discourse can function either to make change in belief and behavior attractive and feasible or to build up resistance to change.[11] The latter function constitutes a significant feature of Paul's rhetoric in 1 Corinthians.

Bryant assigns an important role to rhetoric as a critical discipline. As the rationale of "the informative and suasory in discourse"[12] it furnishes a descriptive vocabulary and a conceptual framework that offers a clearer understanding of what happens "when men adjust to one another in their communications."[13]

UMI

Bryant also argues against limiting the scope of rhetoric. A knowledge of rhetoric can illuminate a wide variety of speech situations.

> Let the discourse be spoken or written, however, the rhetorical function was and is central to the preacher, the teacher, the courtroom lawyer, the labor leader, the politian, the critic. It is central also to the advertiser, the propagandist the journalist, the salesman, the demagogue,-- not only to the individual saint or fanatic, but to the institutionalized, anonymous agents for engineering consent. Furthermore, the rhetorical in discourse spans the spectrum from the most commonplace harangue to the greatest literature.[14]

It is this emphasis on the use of language by a speaker or writer in whatever genre to achieve a defined goal with a particular audience that unites ancient and modern rhetoric. While modern rhetoricians may stress different aspects of the rhetorical process, "argumentation" in Perelman,[15] and "identification" in Burke,[16] they see themselves, nevertheless, as heirs of the tradition of rhetoric articulated by Aristotle and developed and adapted by Cicero, Quintilian, and Augustine.[17]

Professor Brandt, acknowledging the debt modern rhetorical theory owes to classical rhetoric both in its terminology and in its understanding of the rhetorical situation, writes, "It represents a radical innovation grafted onto a very old tradition."[18] The essential difference is that classical rhetoric was a prescriptive discipline designed to train aspiring orators, while modern rhetoric devotes a large part of its energy to the analysis of a wide variety of verbal

UMI

communications.[19]

There is, however, no agreed vocabulary for rhetorical analysis, each critic selecting the terminology which his own training or the nature of the materials suggest. In the preface to his collection of examples of rhetorical criticism, Corbett points out that while many critics employ in their analyses the terminology of classical rhetoric, several operate from a rhetorical perspective without reference to traditional vocabulary.[20]

Since, however, this study, in common with recent example of rhetorical analysis of biblical materials, will employ many of the terms derived from the Roman adaptation of Aristotelian rhetoric it will be necessary to define these terms and the system in which they appear.[21]

Classical rhetoricians listed the tasks to be accomplished in the development of a speech, working from the analysis of the problem and the discovery of relevant material to the actual delivery of the speech:

> *Inventio*: the investigation of the issue and the ways it should be argued.
>
> *Dispositio*: the arrangement of the various parts of the speech.
>
> *Elocutio*: the choice of language and style appropriate to the subject and occasion.
>
> *Memoria*: the techniques of fixing speech in the mind before delivery.
>
> *Pronuntiatio*: the use and management of the voice and body during the delivery of the speech.

The discourse itself was normally divided into five parts: *exordium*, the introduction; *narratio*, the statement of the facts of the case; *confirmatio*, the development of the arguments; *refutatio*, the refutation of opposing views; and the *peroratio*, the summing up of the speech and the final appeal to the audience.

The three means of persuasion open to a speaker were *logos*, the appeal to reason; *pathos*, the appeal to the emotions; and *ethos*, the appeal made by the character of the speaker.

The three types of oratory were named from the occasion on which they took place: debates on public policy, deliberative rhetoric; debates in the law courts, forensic rhetoric; and speeches made on civic occasions, epideictic rhetoric.

Finally, a large part of the activity of the rhetoricians of the Graeco-Roman (and Renaissance) periods was devoted to the naming and defining of figures of speech. The standard collections are Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, and the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.

The reappropriation of the canons and technical vocabulary of Aristoltelian rhetoric stems in part from the dissatisfaction with the efforts of literary critics to deal with oratorical genres.

In his seminal essay, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory", published in 1925,[22] Herbert A. Wichelns pointed out that on the few occasions literary critics dealt with

oratory they concentrated on what was of permanent value in the text. Rhetorical criticism, however, was not concerned with permanence or beauty. Its business was to determine the importance of an utterance at a given time, in a particular place, and to a specific audience.

Wichelns' definition of the relationship of literary criticism to rhetorical criticism suggests a valuable corrective to biblical criticism which underestimates the argumentative and instrumental function:

> Rhetorical criticism lies at the boundary of politics (in the broadest sense) and literature; is that of public life, its tools are those of literature, its concern is with the ideas of people as influenced by their leaders.[23]

Those who followed Wilchelns soon realized that, although the original *Sitz im Leben* of ancient rhetoric was a discourse delivered by an orator to a crowd in a public square, there was no need to limit rhetorical criticism to material produced in this setting, for the dynamics of the situation could be reproduced in other contexts. Thus, for example, writer, letter, recipient, are equivalent to speaker, discourse, audience.[24]

Rhetorical criticism focuses on the interaction of these three elements and has been particularly successful in dealing with occasional literature, "those works which were prompted by contemporary events or concerns of some political or social import."[25]

It is a mode of analysis which takes its readings

about the author and the audience from the text itself. Biographical or historical information obtained from other sources may be of assistance in understanding the author or the occasion, but such information has a subordinate and corroborative function. If, for example, 1 Cor. 1-4 is read in the light of the polemical stance evident in 11 Cor. 10-13 it can lead to a distorted assessment of Paul's attitude and the disposition of the audience.

In the analysis of a speech, and essay, a poem, or a letter, the rhetorical critic is concerned with structure and style. He attempts to isolate the organizational principle chosen by the author (*dispositio*), and to estimate the argumentative significance of the style of the piece (*elocutio*).

These activities correspond to the distinction, already noted, between structural and textual rhetoric. Structural rhetoric deals with the larger segments of a composition and the way in which the organization assists in communicating the author's meaning, while textual rhetoric assesses the function of the author's diction, tropes, figures, and other rhetorical devices.

In addition to attending to structure and style, modern rhetorical analysis stresses the role of the audience in argumentation and draws a distinction between the formal reasoning of the logician and the practical reasoning of the speaker or writer.[26] Prior to a consideration of these aspects of rhetorical criticism as they apply to the

interpretation of the Pauline letter, it is important to arrive at a clear understanding of what is meant by the expression "rhetorical situation."

The Rhetorical Situation

Simply put, a rhetorical situation involves the interaction of a speaker, audience, subject, and communicative purpose. In an essay that attempts to achieve a more precise understanding of the structure of the rhetorical situation, Lloyd Bitzer[27] singles out as the key element, the circumstances that provoked the rhetorical activity: "Not the rhetor and not the persuasive intent, but the situation is the source and ground of rhetorical activity--and, I should add, of rhetorical criticism."[28]

He names as the three constituents of any rhetorical situation, the exigency, the audience to be constrained, and the constraints that influence the orator. These elements are present prior to the construction and delivery of the discourse.

He defines an exigency as something waiting to be done, "an imperfection marked by urgency,"[29] and argues that in any rhetorical situation there is a controlling exigency that acts as an organizing principle, specifying the audience to be addressed and the change to be effected.[30]

The second element in the situation, the audience, is to be distinguished from a mere body of hearers, since a rhetorical audience is made up of persons who can be stimulated

by the discourse to be instruments of change.

Finally, each rhetorical situation is composed of a set of constraints consisting of "persons, events, objects and relations"[31] that have the power to produce the action required to modify the exigency. Typical sources of constraints are "beliefs, attitudes, documents, facts, traditions, and motives."[32]

In preparing his discourse the orator takes these constraints into account, but he also brings to the situation the constraints exercised by the style he adopts, the arguments he introduces, and his personal appeal.

Bitzer draws attention to the phenomenon of recurring situations,[33] occasions, as Aristotle realized, that call for a particular response with its own vocabulary, style, and rhetorical forms.[34] The forms thus generated later function as a constraint on new responses in the genre.[35]

It is important, however, to stress, as Consigny does,[36] that despite the similarities each rhetorical situation is novel; its particularities are constantly changing. Thus the rhetorical critic is concerned with the heuristic function of the orator in discovering and defining the particular issues to be dealt with. He also considers his managerial function in bringing to bear his rhetorical skill in controlling and resolving the situation to his satisfaction.

In the analysis of the rhetorical situation in 1 Cor. 1-4 the stated exigency is the quarreling in the congregation

reported by Chloe's people. The audience addressed is the congregation as a whole (cf. the distribution of the references to "brethren").[37] Paul does single out "the arrogant" as a group at the close of the argumentation (4:18), but his "preferred" audience[38] was the whole congregation, in contrast to the particular audience attributed to the apostles (1:12).

The constraints Paul has to deal with are the professed loyalties to various church leaders, their attitude to Paul (2:6-16; 4:8-13), and the theological positions that sanction their behavior.

What Paul brings to the situation are the appeal of his special relationship to the congregation (4:14-15), and the authority of his apostolic commission. In addition, he is able in the argumentation to draw out the implications of what he and the Corinthians hold in common and, in this way, to expose the inconsistency of their behavior (cf. 1 Cor. 6:1-11).

Finally, he makes a strong emotional appeal (pathos) by referring to their common experience of the gospel (1:9,18), by warnings and exhortations expressed in vivid imagery (3:1-4,5-17; 4:5): by reference to his special relationship to the congregation (4:14-16); and by expressions of indignation against those who questioned his intention to visit the congregation (4:18-20).

In the investigation of the issue to be discussed,[39]

UMI

classical rhetoricians drew an interesting distinction between a general question, *questio infinita* or thesis, and a particular case, *questio finita* or *causa*. A stock illustration of the general question was: "Should a man marry?" When expressed as a particular question, limited by time, place, and person, it asks: "Should Cato marry Marcia?" The parallel to 1 Corinthians chapter seven immediately suggests itself.[40]

The example, however, is not cited to argue for any sort of influence, but rather to point out that Paul's practice of moving from particular instances to general principles is a recognized rhetorical move, and can be analyzed as such, without positing indebtedness to a particular rhetorical tradition.

Structure and Style

The reluctance to accept consideration of structure and modes of argumentation as legitimate concerns of rhetoric, already noticed in Doty's work,[41] was until recently pervasive in biblical studies.[42] A representative example is Hans Conzelman's commentary on 1 Corinthians.[43] He organizes the introductory material under three headings; language, in which he discusses diction, figures of speech, and other stylistic devices; form, in which he deals with the structure of the letter; and methods of presentation and argumentation.[44] He rejects Weiss' suggestion about the structure of the letter as being "too much under the

influence of rhetoric."[45] Nevertheless, it is to Weiss that he frequently turns when dealing with matters of structure.[46]

Moreover, the frequent use of the terms "rhetoric" and "rhetorical" show an awareness of the need to account for the argumentative function of the stylistic features, but, at the same time, betray a subliminal discomfort at not being able to relate style, structure and argumantation to the total argumentative situation.[47]

Conzelmann is working with a concept of rhetoric inherited from the Ramist tradition of rhetoric that emerged in the sixteenth century and virtually eclipsed the Aristotelian-Ciceronian rhetorical tradition.[48]

Peter Ramus (1515-1592) broke away from the formalism of the scholastics and attempted to unite eloquence and philosophy. To do this he rejected the Artistotelian distinction between science and opinion, between analytic reasoning, with its "necessary" reasons, and dialectic reasoning, with its "probable" reasons. Aristotle treats the former in his *Analytics*, and the latter in his *Topics*, *Sophistical Refutation* and *Rhetoric*.[49]

Ramus' close associate in his program of reformation, Omer Ralon, undertook to expound the reformed rhetoric, while Ramus wrote the logic. In the preface to his work on rhetoric Talon summed up his position as follows:

> Peter Ramus cleaned up the theory of invention, arrangement, and memory, and returned these subjects to logic, where they properly belong. Then assisted

> indeed by his lectures and opinions, I recalled rhetoric to style and delivery (since these are the only parts proper to it) . . . and I illustrated it with examples drawn from oratory and poetry.[50]

The enormous popularity of Ramus' work has been chronicled by Father Ong, who lists eight hundred editions of Ramist writings located in nearly two hundred European and American libraries.[51] Although there was resistance from Melanchthon, who espoused the Ciceronian tradition, nevertheless, by the end of the sixteenth century the "French Calvinist school of Ramus and Talon triumphed over the German-Lutheran school of Melanchthon and Sturm."[52]

Perelman notes that, although classical rhetoric has continued to be studied in Germany by scholars such as Blass, Kroll, and Solmsen, the focus of their work has been on rhetoric as a theory of literary prose. Even Lausberg's work, which Perelman praises as "the best tool in existence for the study of rhetorical terminology and the structure of discourse," is, nevertheless, regarded by Lausberg himself as "a contribution to the study of literary language and tradition."[53]

Weiss, despite his dissatisfaction with the work of Blass, Heinrici and Wilke, was chiefly concerned with Paul's prose style. His special interest was to demonstrate the oral quality of Paul's style.[54] His study did, however, lead him to recognize that Paul uses the various types of parallelism to structure his thought, often extending beyond the sentence

to larger units, with elaborate symmetries and correspondences.[55]

It is this aspect of his work that attracted Wilhelm Lund. Building on the work of Robert Lowth, Thomas Boys, John Forbes, and Bishop Jebb, he argued for the use of chiasmus as a structuring device in extended sections of the Gospels, the letters of Paul, and the Book of Revelation.[56]

Although his book received several favorable reviews, his work had, at the time, little impact on New Testament scholarship.[57] More recently, however, a more positive assessment has been given by Lundbom,[58] Bailey,[59] and Turner.[60]

Recent studies in English literature, the classics, and biblical studies support Weiss and Lund's insistence on the presence of previously undetected symmetries in ancient literature.[61]

R. G. Peterson cites as an example of the importance of the author's principle of organization, the complicated and highly symmetrical structures recently discovered in Spencer's *Epithalamium*. He also draws attention to Cedric H. Whitman's detection of ring composition in Homer, similar discoveries made in Catullus, and Duckworth's exposition of the elaborate series of numerical relationships and the alternating (AB, BA), concentric (ABCD, DCBA), and triadic (ABA--ABA) structures in Vergil's *Aeneid*.[62]

Peterson also discusses a problem faced by those whose

wish to demonstrate the presence of structuring patterns in biblical material: What may be legitimately included in a structure? Peterson argues that "events, images, themes, chapters, pages, and lines and even feet" may be counted. The criterion that he advances is that the items chosen should be in "fruitful relationship (harmony, contrast, conflict, etc.) with the obvious narrative, thematic, or symbolic concerns in the work."[63]

Historians of rhetoric classify the rhetorics that emerged during the Renaissance period as the Traditionalists, who taught the five-part Ciceronian tradition; the Ramists, who reduced the province of rhetoric to style and delivery; and the Figurists, whose chief interest was the classification and study of tropes and figures.[64]

Although there was much more overlapping of interest, subsequent rhetorics may, with some degree of accuracy, be assigned to one or other of these groups.

Many students of biblical literature were attracted to the latter group. Most attempts to write "sacred" rhetorics turn out to be a compilation and classification of figures of speech found in the Bible.

Following the precedent set by the Venerable Bede in his *De Schematibus Et Tropis*,[65] John Smith, *The Mystery of Rhetoric Unvail'd* (1657) uses examples drawn from Scripture in his definitions of the figures of speech. Thomas Hall's *Centuria Sacra* (1654) includes a compendium of "the most

material Tropes and Figures contained in the Scriptures."[66]

The compilations of C. G. Wilke (1843)[67] and E. W. Bullinger (1898)[68] belong in the same tradition. A more recent addition to the genre is Bühlmann and Scherer, *Stilfiguren der Bibel* (1973).[69]

When considering Paul's style it is necessary, however, to draw a distinction between a literary and rhetorical evaluation of figures of speech and other stylistic features. Both deal with diction, word order, tropes, and figures, but what makes attention to style rhetorical is the attempt to relate stylistic features not to aesthetic evaluation but to the effect the author wishes to produce on his audience.[70] Thus in the textual analysis of 1 Cor. 1-4 an attempt will be made to relate the stylistic resourses Paul consciously--or unconsciously--employs to the ends he set out to achieve.

Professor Brandt's work is especially helpful in his treatment of figures of speech. He not only reduces the elaborate and often contradictory compendia of Graeco-Roman and Renaissance rhetoricians to manageable proportions but he also suggests a classification of the functions figures normally play in a composition--emphasis, division, comparison difinition or redefinition.[71]

Following Quintilian, Professor Brandt also relates the figures to the three modes of appeal, *logos*, *pathos*, and *ethos*. Figures could either lend credibility to an argument, excite emotions, or win approval for the character of the

speaker (Inst. Orat. IX.1).[72]

Perelman and Tyteca propose a classification of figures according to "choice, presence, or communion." Figures function in the presentation of the argumentation either to impose a choice, to increase the impression of presence, or to bring about communion with the audience.[73]

Both Brandt and Perelman would agree, however, that the task of the rhetorical critic is to evaluate the role figures play in argumentation. As Perelman puts it: "If their argumentative role is disregarded, the study of figures is a useless pastime."[74]

Audience

Looked at in this way, the evaluation of the role of figures of speech, and other stylistic devices inevitably brings into focus the audience the speaker/writer is seeking to influence. Each piece of literature has its terminus in the response of an audience, and the intention of the author to induce his audience to accept a certain point of view or to act in a certain way forces him to adopt a style and a mode of argument that will serve his purpose. Perelman does not overstate the matter when he writes: "The part played by the audience in rhetoric is crucially important, because all argumentation is aimed to persuade and must be adapted to the audience."[75]

In his article, "The Writer's Audience Is Always a Fiction," Father Ong addresses himself to the role the audience

plays in oral and written communication and the way in which an author gives body to the audience for which he writes.[76]

Father Ong argues that the writer has no choice but to set up a relationship to the reader different from that of personal contact. He shares with the scientist, the historian, or the letter writer the task of fictionalizing his audience, of casting them in a made-up role, and of calling on them to play the role assigned.[77]

This understanding of the task of the letter writer and of his relationship to his audience has important implications for the study of 1 Corinthians.

The audience is not to be regarded as passive recipients of a communication from Paul, but as the construction of Paul. This is not to argue that the audience is fictional; rather it is to underline the contention that description of the Corinthian community, the diagnosis of its problems, the delineation of certain points of view and of attitudes toward Paul held by the Corinthians represent a series of choices and judgements by Paul.

As Paul proceeds to encourage, rebuke, conciliate, and persuade he anticipates the changes which should occur in the audience in the course of the letter and adjusts his strategies of persuasion and the style he adopts, accordingly.

For example, he delays his attack on the spiritual pride of the Corinthians until he judges that his criticism will not alienate them, (1 Cor. 4:6-13) and he follows this attack

with an appeal to his special relationship to them (1 Cor. 4:14-18).

Thus the rehtorical critic focuses on this interplay between author and audience as it is revealed in the constant adjustment of the author to the opinions and the attitudes he believes to be held by the audience. Modern rhetorical analysis provides a vocabulary to describe these phenomena and offers a way of reading Paul's letters that can do justice to their argumentative dimension.

Argumentation

The recognition by Dieter Georgi of the importance of the role played by the opponents of Paul in the formulation of his theology has led to a new interesnt in theology as argumentation.[78] The articulation of the muted voices of opposition present in Paul's letters was seen as providing clues, essential for the interpretation of these documents and for an understanding of the inner-Christian controversies that produced them.[79]

"Theology" argues James Robinson, "is the point being scored" in each new argumentative situation.[80] The premature harmonizing of the positions Paul adopts can easily lead, for example, to the misreading of the nature of the problems represented by the Corinthian letters.[81]

Viewed in this way, Paul's letters are neither consistent systematic presentations of Pauline theology, nor examples of his literary skill, but records of his attempts in

particular situations to obtain or reinforce the commitment of his audience to his understanding of the gospel.[82]

The value of the work of Brandt and Perelman is that they provide a technical vocabulary and a theoretical framework for the critical reading of argumentative prose. When Paul's letters are approached in this way it becomes possible to determine the rhetorical situation and to examine the interaction of structure, style, and audience.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

1. For a brief account, see Donald C. Bryant, "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope Redeviva," in his *Rhetorical Dimensions in Criticism* (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: State Univ. Press, 1973); reprinted in Walter R. Fisher, ed., *Rhetoric: A Tradition in Transition* (East Lansing, Michigan: State Univ. Press, 1974), pp. 231-247.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 234. For a discussion of the theoretical issues, see Wayne C. Booth, "The Revival of Rhetoric," *PMLA* 53 (1965): 8-12.

3. For an account of the Cornell tradition, see Everett Lee Hunt, "Herbert A. Wichelns and the Cornell Tradition of Rhetoric as a Humane Study," in Donald C. Bryant, ed., *The Rhetorical Idiom* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1958), pp. 1-4. Chaim Perelman, "The New Rhetoric: A Theory of Practical Reasoning," in *Great Ideas Today* (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica,1970), pp. 273-312, regards the work of these scholars and others--such as Wilbur Samuel Howell, Karl allace, Walter J. Ong, Lloyd Bitzer, Douglass Ehninger, and Marie K. Hochmuth--as constituting "a unique achievement which is yet too little known outside the United States," p.277 and note 7, p. 308. For a convenient bibliography of their work, see Donald Leman Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1957), pp. 272-276.

4. See the bibliography in Corbett, *Rhetorical Analyses*, pp. 233-272, and for a review of this work by Philip K. Tompkins, *QJS* 55 (December 1969): 431-439. For the rhetoric of fictional narrative, see Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1961).

5. Ivor Armstrong Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1936).

6. Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, (Paperback edition; Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1969, original edition 1945) and *A Rhetoric of Motives*, (Paperback edition; Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1969, original edition 1950). For an introduction to Burke's rhetorical theories, see Daniel Fogarty, *Roots for a New Rhetoric* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia Teachers College, 1959) and William H. Rueckert, *Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, 1924-1966* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1969).

7. Perelman, *New Rhetoric*. For a discussion of this work in relation to recent works on rhetoric, see Helen North, "Ancient Salt: The New Rhetoric and the Old," in *JHI* 35 (1974): 349-356.

UMI

8. The original essay, "Rhetoric: Its Function and Its Scope," appeared in *QJS* 39 (1953):401-424. For the development of rhetorical theory in the Graeco-Roman period, see George Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1963), and *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World 300 B.C.- A.D. 300* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1972). For the Byzantine period, see George L. Kustas, *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric* (Thessalonica: Patriarchical Institute for Patristic Studies, 1973). For the Middle Ages, see James J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1974), and his *Medieval Rhetoric: A Select Bibliography* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1971). The standard German work is Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Ein Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, 2 vols. (Munich: Max Huebner, 1960). For a less detailed exposition, see his *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik* 3d ed., Munich; Max Huebner, 1967).

9. Donald C. Bryant, "Rhetoric: Its Function and Its Scope Redeviva," p. 244

10. *Ibid.*, p. 242

11. *Ibid.*

12. *Ibid.*, p. 239

13. *Ibid.*, p. 241

14. *Ibid.*, p. 243

15. Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, pp. 1-10.

16. See, for example, Kenneth Burke, *Rhetoric of Motives*, pp. 19-27, 45-46, 55-59.

17. Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, pp. 5-9; Kenneth Burke, *Rhetoric of Motives*, pp. 51-55.

18. William J. Brandt, *Rhetoric*, Preface, p. viii.

19. *Ibid.*

20. Corbett, *Rhetorical Analyses*, p. 86.

21. The fullest and most convenient glossary of rhetorical terminology in English is Richard A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1968).

22. Herbert A. Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory,"

in *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans*, Alexander M. Drummond, ed. (New York: Century Co., 1925), pp. 181-216; reprinted in Donald C. Bryant, ed., *The Rhetorical Idiom*, pp. 5-42.

23. *Ibid.*

24. Since Paul's letters are to be read out loud, both aspects come into view and sanction the use of either set of terms.

25. Corbett, *Rhetorical Analyses*, Introduction, p. xxii.

26. On the place of informal reasoning in rhetoric, see Brandt, *Rhetoric*, pp. 24-48; Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, pp. 1-9; Stephen Toulmin, *The Uses of Argument* (London: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1958); Howard Kahane, *Logic and Contemporary Rhetoric: The Use of Reason in Everyday Life* (Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Publ. Co., 1971), and Douglas Ehninger, *Influence, Belief and Argument* (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1974).

27. Lloyd Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," *PR* 1 (1965): 1-14; reprinted in *Rhetoric: A Tradition in Transition* pp. 247-260. The essay provoked several responses that debated chiefly the extent to which the situation *determined* the response of the orator. See Richard Vatz, "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation," *PR* 6 (1973): 152-161; Richard Burke, "Rhetoric, Dialectic, and Force," *PR* 7 (1974): 154-165: and Scott Consigny, "Rhetoric and Its Situations," *PR* 7 (1974): 175-186.

28. Lloyd Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," p. 252.

29. *Ibid.*

30. *Ibid.*, p. 253

31. *Ibid.*, p. 254

32. *Ibid.*

33. *Ibid.*, p. 259

34. For Aristotle's discussion of the occasions of rhetoric--deliberative, forensic, and epideictic--and the different approach each required, see his *Rhetoric*, 1.3. 1359a.

35. "Generic constraints" are defined and discussed by Kathleen M. Hall Jamieson, "Generic Constraints and the Rhetorical Situation," *PR* 6 (1973): 162-170, and also "The

UMI

Standardization and Modification of Rhetorical Genres: A Perspective," *Genre* 8 (1975): 183-193.

36. Scott Consigny, "Rhetoric and Its Situations," p. 180.

37. 1 Cor. 1-10, 1:11, 1:26, 2:1, 3:1, 4:6.

38. For the distinction between the ostensible and the preferred audience, see Brandt, *Rhetoric*, p. 91.

39. For a convenient discussion, see Donald Leman Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education*, pp. 130-133.

40. Paul's practice coincides with Cicero's advice (*Orator*, xiv, 45-46): "Whenever he can, the orator will divert the controversy from particular persons and circumstances to universal questions, for he can debate a genus on wider grounds than a species." Cited in Donald Leman Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education*, p. 131.

41. See chapter one, note 37.

42. For an assessment of Muilenburg's interest in structure and his contribution to rhetorical criticism, see Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric* (SBL Dissertation Series 18, Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature, 1975), pp. 1-2.

43. Hans Conzelmann, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, trans. James W. Leith (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

44. *Ibid.*, pp. 5-9

45. *Ibid.*, p. 6, n. 2.

46. See, for example, his comments on 1 Cor. 4:11-13, at p. 89, n. 45, and on 1 Cor. 9:20, at p. 160, n. 20.

47. See, for example, p. 5, n. 36, "The choice of words is governed partly by object . . . by *rhetoric*, and even simply by chance"; p. 89, " μωρός is merely a *rhetorical* variation"; p. 91, n. 10, "*rhetorical* exaggeration"; p. 99, n. 53, "the duplication is *rhetorical*"; p. 101, n. 71, "a certain *rhetorical* order"; p. 111, "The *rhetorical* expression must not be pressed." p. 160, "The *rhetorical* parallelism can obscure the fact"; and p. 161, "Important here not only for the sake of *rhetoric*." (Italics mine.)

48. See Perelman, "The New Rhetoric: A Theory of Practical Reasoning," p. 274.

49. *Ibid.*

50. Cited in Wilbur Samuel Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1961), pp. 148-149.

51. Walter J Ong, S. J., *Ramus and the Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press,1958), and his *Ramus and Talon Inventory* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1958).

52. Edward P. J. Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1971), p. 612. For an account of Sturm and Melanchthon's relationship to Ramus' rhetoric, see Ong, *Method and Decay of Dialogue*, pp. 232-239. For a discussion of Melanchthon's interest in rhetoric, see J. R. McNally, "Melanchthon's Earliest Rhetoric," in Walter Fisher, ed. *Rhetoric: A Tradition in Transition*, pp. 33-48; Quirinius Breen, "Three Renaissance Humanists on the Relation of Philosophy and Rhetoric," and "The Terms 'Loci Communes' and 'Loci' in Melanchthon," in his *Christianity and Humanism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), pp. 1-68, 93-105.

53. Perelman, "The New Rhetoric: A Theory of Practical Reasoning," p. 276.

54. Johannes Weiss, *Beiträge*, p. 167: "Im Wesentlichen drehen sich die folgenden Erorterungen um die Satzfugung in den paulinischen Briefen." See the comments on Weiss' study in Norbert Schneider, *Die rhetorische Eigenart der paulinschen Antithese* (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1970), pp. 3-5. On the oral quality of Paul's style, see Weiss, *Beiträge*, p.111, where he insists that "we must regard the passage to be explained as oral and designed for the ear, and must also read it with the ear." Cf. his remarks on 1 Corinthians, *Aufgaben*, p. 17: "Man kann den 1 Korintherbrief nich verstehen, wenn man ihn mit dem Auge liest, man muss ihn laut lesen." For an interesting account of the influence of oral culture on Greek prose, see Charles Rown Beye, "The Beginnings of Prose," in his *Ancient Greek Literature and Society* (Anchor Books; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1975), pp. 185-240.

55. See, for example, his *Beiträge*, pp. 168-175, especially his analysis of 1 Corinthians 13, pp. 196-200.

56. Nils Wilhelm Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1942); "The Presence of Chiasmus in the New Testament," *JR* 10 (1930): 74-93; "The Literary Structure of Paul's Hymn to Love," *JBL* 50 (1931) 266-276; "The Significance of Chiasmus for Interpretation," *CQ* 20 (1943): 105-123; and *Outline Studies in the Book of*

Revelation (Chicago: Covenant Book Concern, 1935).

57. See the reviews by Henry Cadbury, *JR* 23 (1943): 62-63, and T. W. Manson, *JTS* 45 (1944): 81-84.

58. Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah*, pp. 17-18.

59. Kenneth E. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,1976), pp. 46-47.

60. Nigel Turner, "The Style of Paul" in *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1908-1976), vol. 4: *Style*, pp. 80-99 (see especially p.97).

61. For a discussion of symmetrical structures in classical literature and the terminology used by scholars to describe the phenomenon ("Framework pattern," "Chinese Box," "pediment composition," "recessed panel pattern," "Schleifengang," "ring composition," etc.,), see B. L. Hijmans, Jr., *Inlaboratus et Facilis*, pp. 131-134. For an extensive bibliography, see p. 132, n. 6. R. G. Peterson combines ancient and modern examples, "Critical Calculations: Measure and Symmetry in Literature," *PMLA* 91 (1976): 367-375.

62. *Ibid.*, pp. 367-368.

63. *Ibid.*, p. 370.

64. Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric*, p. 608. For a list of sixteenth century works on logic, arranged under these headings, see Sister Miriam Joseph, *Rhetoric in Shakespeare's Time: Literary Theory of Renaissance Europe* (Harbinger Books; New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962), pp. 13-14. This material appeared originally in her larger work, *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1947).

65. Gussie Hecht Tanenhaus, "Bede's De Schematibus et Tropis-A Translation," *QJS* 48 (1962): 237-253.

66. Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric*, p. 615.

67. C. G. Wilke, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik: Ein Seitenstuck zur Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* (Dresden, 1843).

68. E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible* (London, 1898; reprint edition, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968).

UMI

69. Walter Bühlmann and Karl Scherer, *Stilfiguren der Bibel* (Fribourg: Schweizerisches Katholisches Bibelwork, 1973).

70. Longinus (*On the Sublime*, xv. 9) in commenting on the rhetorical function of oratorical imagery, writes: "Well, it is able in many ways to infuse vehemence and passion into spoken words, while more particularly when it is combined with the argumentative passages it not only persuades the hearer but actually makes him its slave." Cited in Corbett, *Rhetoric*, p. 459.

71. Brandt, *Rhetoric*, pp. 101-110.

72. *Ibid.*, pp. 117-120, 281-283.

73. Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, pp. 171-172.

74. Perelman, "New Rhetoric: A Theory of Practical Reasoning," p. 289.

75. *Ibid.*, p. 286. See also, Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, p. 23-26.

76. Walter J. Ong, S. J., "The Writer's Audience Is Always a Fiction," *PMLA* 90 (1975): 9-21; now reprinted in his *Interfaces of the Word* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1977), 53-81.

77. *Ibid.*, pp. 17-19.

78. Dieter Georgi, *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief*, (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1964).

79. See J. J. Gunther, *St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973).

80. James M. Robinson, "Kerygma and History in the New Testament," in James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), p. 66.

81. *Ibid.*, p. 64-65.

82. See, for example, Krister Stendahl's reply to E. P. Sanders' review of his *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press,1976), in "A Response," *USQR* 33 (1978): 189-191: "But the decisive difference between Sanders and me lies in our attitude to the text, toward the genre of letters. I read Paul as a pastoral theologian, where Sanders reads him as a systematic theologian . . . . As an exegete, I, therefore, must give strong emphasis not only to the words, but to the intention, the thrust of the argument

UMI

which has been overshadowed by those exegetes who seek and find in Paul's letters the building blocks for a theology organized by the topics of Christian theology," p. 190.

CHAPTER III

THE TEXTUAL RHETORIC OF 1 CORINTHIANS 1-4

Textual Rhetoric

The purpose of a textual analysis is to indicate the role played in the argumentation by stylistic features such as diction, word order, and figures of speech. It also seeks to evaluate the influence the author's perception of his audience had on the rhetorical strategies he chose to accomplish his goals.

"Textual rhetoric" is concerned with the persuasive function of language at the sentence and paragraph level, whereas "structural rhetoric" is concerned with the function of these paragraphs or sections of the argumentation in the overall argumentative strategy. The dual responsibility of developing an argument and maintaining close rapport with the audience, do, of course, manifest themselves at the textual level, but the distinctive problem of the interrelation of the arguments and the progressive conditioning of the audience during the discourse require the distinction.[1]

In order to discuss Paul's textual rhetoric it will be necessary to determine the limits and structure of the individual paragraphs or units of the argument. Useful in this respect, as will be shown in the analysis, are direct

appeals to the audience, rhetorical questions, word clusters, structuring devices such as *inclusio* and chiasmus, and the use of the divine names as signals that the discussion in a particular section has been brought to a conclusion.[2]

The detection of the limits of a unit is often made easy by the apparent lack of continuity between the sections. Chapters nine and thirteen of 1 Corinthians are convenient examples.

The purpose of the delineation of these units and their internal organization is not to make a statement about Paul's literary artistry or his use of a particular form; rather, it is to examine their argumentative function. And in the analysis of their textual rhetoric that follows, the use of the technical vocabulary of rhetorical criticism is designed to facilitate a more precise reading of Paul's argumentative intention and the strategies he employs to persuade the Corinthians to accept his point of view.[3]

Since the *repetitios* are too numerous to note in the margin, they are typed in italics in the text. The translation used is the Revised Standard Version, occasionally rearranged to reflect the structure of the Greek text. The printed Greek text is that of the American Bible Society, first edition (1966).

1 Corinthians 1:1-10

1. Παῦλος, κλητὸς ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ
διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ,
καὶ Σωσθένης ὁ ἀδελφός,
2. τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ
τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ,

ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστοῦ,
κλητοῖς ἁγίοις,
σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις
τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ,
αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν.

3. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη
ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν
καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

4. Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν
ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ
τῇ δοθείσῃ ὑμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,

5. ὅτι ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίσθητε ἐν αὐτῷ,
ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει,
6. καθὼς τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν,
7. ὥστε ὑμᾶς μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι,
ἀπεκδεχομένους τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν
τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
8. ὃς καὶ βεβαιώσει ὑμᾶς ἕως τέλους
ἀνεγκλήτους ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

9. πιστὸς ὁ θεός δι' οὗ ἐκλήθητε εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

10. Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί,
διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες,
καὶ μὴ ᾖ ἐν ὑμῖν σχίσματα,
ἦτε δὲ κατηρτισμένοι
ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοῒ
καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ.

1 Corinthians 1:1-10

1. Paul, *called* to be an apostle of *Christ Jesus*
   by the will of *God*,
   and Sosthenes our brother — *Epithet*
2. to the church of *God*
   which is in Corinth,

   to those who are sanctified in *Christ Jesus*
   called to be saints,
   together with all who *call upon* — *Accumulation*
   the *name of our Lord Jesus Christ*
   in every place,
   both their Lord and ours. — *Correctio*

3. Grace to you and peace
   From *God* our Father — *Epithet*
   and the *Lord Jesus Christ*

4. I give thanks to my *God* always for you
   for the grace of *God*
   which was given to you in *Christ Jesus*,

5. that in every way you were enriched in him,
   with all speech and knowledge, — *Accumulation*
6. even as the witness to *Christ* was *confirmed* among you,
7. so that you are not lacking in any spiritual gift,
   as you wait for the revealing — *Litotes*
   of *our Lord Jesus Christ*
8. who will *sustain* you to the end, — *Accumulation*
   guiltless in the day of *our Lord Jesus Christ*.

9. *God* is faithful, by whom you were *called* into the
   fellowship of his Son,
   Jesus Christ our Lord. — *Sententia*

10. I appeal to you, brethren, — *Argument from Authority*
    by the *name of our Lord Jesus Christ*
    that all of you agree
    and that there be no *dissension* among you, — *Synonymia*
    but that you *be united*
    in the *same* mind — *Accumulation*
    and in the *same* judgment.

1 Corinthians 1:1-10 serves as an introduction to the letter as a whole, and to the sustained argument that concludes with the rhetorical question in 4:21. It consists of the Greeting (vv. 103), the Thanksgiving period (vv. 4-9), and the "parakalo" period (v. 10).

The unity of the introduction is supported by the repetition of the divine names. There are six references to God and eleven to Jesus Christ, with significant variations. The "parakalo" period is linked with the Greeting by the appeal in "the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," (vv. 2,10; cf. also vv. 7,8,9).

The use of the divine names, usually in tandem (vv. 1, 3,4,9) articulate the relationship between God and Christ and between Paul and the Corinthians and Jesus Christ. It also functions to give a christological focus to the ensuing discussion and to raise for the Corinthians the question of the obligations involved in their membership in the church of God in Corinth (v. 1).

Paul uses the conventions of the letter form to identify himself and the recipients of the letter. As in his other correspondence, however, Paul exploits the epistolary conventions for rhetorical purposes. He uses the opportunity to select an *ethos* for himself appropriate to the persuasive intent of the letter,[4] to identify and describe his audience, and to give some indication of the problem to be discussed.

Since he had founded the congregation at Corinth

(Acts 18:1-17) and had previously written to them (1 Cor. 5:9), this letter, unlike Romans, represents a renewal of communication with a congregation he had founded. Consequently, it had reference to a set of experiences that constitute an important feature of the rhetorical situation and offers a key to the persuasive strategies Paul adopts.

The significant features of the textual rhetoric of the introduction are the *repetitios*,[5] *accumulation*,[6] and the use of pronouns.

Paul introduces himself to his audience as one who has been called by the will of God to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, and he acts towards the Corinthians with the authority the office confers. He establishes this ethos by setting out their common relationship to God through Christ. He is *called* (κλητος) to be an apostle (v. 1), while the Corinthians are *called* (κλητοῖς) to be saints (v. 2), and God is faithful through whom *they were called* (ἐκλήθητε) (v. 9) Paul is an apostle of *Jesus Christ* (v. 1), while the Corinthians are sanctified in Christ Jesus (v. 2). In the "parakalo" period (v. 10) he appeals for unity in *the name of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

Expanding by *accumulation* on his initial *paraphrasis*[7] for the Christian community in Corinth, "the church of God," Paul describes them as those who are "sanctified in Christ," "called to be saints" and links them up with other Christians, designated by the biblical paraphrase, "those who in every

place call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (v. 2). The *correctio*[8] "of them and us" sets the Corinthians in the wider context of all who are united by their loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ.

In the Thanksgiving, Paul further defines his audience by expanding on what is involved in the gift of the grace of God (v. 4): they were enriched by gifts of knowledge and utterance (v. 5), a claim reiterated in the *litotes*,[9] "you are not lacking in any spiritual gift" (v. 7).

The praise for the spiritual endowments of the Corinthians is, however, placed in the context of "the day of our Lord Jesus Christ" (v. 8). The responsibility of the Corinthians to employ their spiritual gifts in the light of the eschaton, "as you wait for the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ" (v. 7) is emphasized by the need to be kept (βεβαιώσει) guiltless (ἀνεγκλήτους) in the intervening period (v. 7).

The praise of the Corinthian's gifts performs two functions for Paul. In the first place, he enhances his own ethos by praising the Corinthians and by declaring his confidence in God's faithfulness and willingness to sustain them until the parousia (vv. 8-9). Secondly, by introducing the eschatological motif at the beginning of the discourse he establishes a mood and a perspective that is designed to work on the feelings of the Corinthians and to have a cumulative effect as Paul further develops the theme later in the discourse (cf. 3:5-17, 21b-23; 4:1-5).[10]

The use of pronouns of the first and second person, together with the ending of the finite verb reveal "the rhythmical interchange between the first and second persons which is basic to the structure of the Thanksgiving."[11] By the use of the first person pronoun (ἡμῶν)(vv. 2,7,8,9,10) Paul identifies with the Corinthians in their relationship Jesus Christ. He speaks of their relationship to God in Christ in pronouns of the second person. (περὶ ὑμῶν) (v. 4), (ὑμᾶς) (4b), (ἐν ὑμῖν) (v. 6), (ὑμᾶς) (v. 7), (ὑμᾶς) (v. 8). Thus, by the use of pronouns, Paul is able to indicate the set of relationships brought about by the call of God. He unites with the congregation in their allegiance to Jesus Christ and to all other Christians (v. 2). He distinguishes himself from Sosthenes by the epithetical, "our brother"[12] and from the Corinthians in his apostolic role (vv. 4,10).

The Thanksgiving closes with a *sententia*--"a statement that has only to be heard or read to command assent." It is an expression of confidence in God who had called the Corinthians into fellowship with his Son (v. 9), and summarizes what Paul had just affirmed. But it also raises the question of the nature of the relationship (κοινωνίαν) into which they had been called.

In contrast to this affirmation, Paul introduced the problem of disunity within the fellowship in the "parakalo" period (v. 10). The exhortation to unity is expressed in two parallel clauses, "that all of you agree" and "that you be

united in the same mind and in the same purpose." The problem of disunity is obliquely introduced in the intervening negative clause, "that there be no dissensions (σχίσματα) among you."

Paul's concern not to alienate the Corinthians is seen in the careful manner he introduced the matter of the dissension within the congregation. The *accumulation* expressed in the synonyms for harmony (τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες ἦτε δὲ κατηρτισμένοι), and in the doublet (ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοῒ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ) emphasize the state of affairs Paul desired to prevail. Also, the appeal to the Corinthians as "brethren" and the invocation of "the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" gains added emotional force from the description of the Christian community Paul has just given and from the previous references to Jesus Christ.

In the introduction Paul has accomplished several tasks. He has defined himself for the Corinthians by presenting himself as an apostle of Jesus Christ. His relationship to his audience is also determined by his apostolic commission.

He has been called by God to be an apostle and he adopts the stance implied by that office when he thanks God for the gifts they had received (vv. 4-9) and appeals to them in the name of Jesus Christ to be united (v. 10). In his praise of the congregation and in the oblique manner in which he introduced the problem of disunity Paul signalled clearly that he intended to gain the goodwill of the congregation.

UMI

Finally, in his initial statement of the problem he indicated his belief that dissension could be eliminated and theological harmony could be restored.

1 Corinthians 1:11-17

11. ἐδηλώθη γάρ μοι περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί μου,
ὑπὸ τῶν Χλόης,
ὅτι ἔριδες ἐν ὑμῖν εἰσιν.

12. λέγω δὲ τοῦτο
ὅτι ἕκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει,
Ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου,
Ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ,
Ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ,
Ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ.

13. μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός;
μὴ Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη ὑπερ ὑμῶν;
ἢ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου ἐβαπτίσθητε;

14. εὐχαριστῶ ὅτι οὐδενα ὑμῶν ἐβάπτισα
εἰ μη Κρίσπον και Γάϊον,
15. ἵνα μή τις εἴπῃ
ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἐβαπτισθητε.
16. ἐβάπτισα δὲ καὶ τὸν Στεφανᾶ οἶκον,
λοιπὸν οὐκ οἶδα εἴ τινα ἄλλον ἐβάπτισα.

17. οὐ γὰρ ἀπεστειλέν με Χριστος βαπτίζειν
ἀλλὰ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι,
οὐκ ἐω σοφίᾳ λόγου,
ἵνα μη κενωθῇ ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

11. For it has been reported to me
by Chloe's people
that there is *quarreling* among you, my brethren.

12. What I mean is
that each of you says,
I belong to Paul — *Anaphoric Gradatio*
I belong to Apollos
I belong to Cephas — *Paronomasia*
I belong to Christ.

13. Is *Christ* divided? — *Rhetorical Questions*
Was Paul *crucified* for you?
Or were you *baptized* in the name of Paul? *Enthymeme*

14. I am thankful that I *baptized* none of you
except Crispus and Gaius;
15. lest anyone should say *Prolepsis*
that you were *baptized* in my name.
16. I did *baptize* also the household of Stephanus. *Ethos*
Beyond that, I do not know whether I *baptized* anyone else.

17. For *Christ* did not send me to *baptize* *Antithesis*
but to preach the gospel, *Ethos*
and not with eloquent wisdom, *Transition*
lest the *cross* of Christ be emptied of its power.

Logically, one might expect the basis of the complaint, the report from Chloe's people, to precede the exhortation. But Paul wishes to focus on the problem and not on the source of the information. He led the audience slowly to the specifics of the complaint, already anticipated in the vocabulary of community strife, dissension (σχίσματα) (v. 10) and quarreling (ἔριδες) (v. 11), and addressed them as "my brethren."

Paul chose to present the problem dramatically in a *demonstratio*, a figure "which sets things out in such a way that the matter seems to unfold, and the thing to happen, under our eyes."[13] The dramatic quality of the figure is emphasized by the *anaphoric gradatio*,[14] with its repetition of "I" ('Εγω) and the progression from Paul, through Apollos and Peter to Christ. Further emphasis is lent by the *paronomasia* by which Paul and Apollos are linked by the "p" sound, Paul and Apollos, and the guttural sounds "κ" and "χ" that associate Cephas and Christ (v. 12).

In the introduction Paul alludes to the presence of conflict within the congregation and urges them to adopt a unified theological position (v. 10). In this section he illustrates the nature of the disunity. The clamor of individual voices is destructive of unity: the "each" of verse twelve contrasts with the "all" of verse ten. Moreover, the absence of unity manifests itself in professions of loyalty to figures of authority and significance in the church. In the rest of the argument Paul is not concerned with parties represented by the slogans; rather, he sets out to expose the false ways of thinking that prompted these professions of loyalty. The *anaphora* supports the contention that the emphasis is more on the competitive strife than on the figures themselves or the particular theological positions they represented, or, more probably, were believed by the Corinthians to represent.[15]

By the use of *anaphoric graditio* Paul not only reports the information he had received from Chloe's people, he reenacts, as it were, the behavior within the church at Corinth and indicates his disapproval of the spectacle (cf. 14:26) and invites theirs.

Having introduced the problem, Paul in this section (vv. 13-17) enters on the body of the argument. He begins by putting his audience on the defensive with three rhetorical questions. He intensifies the emotional tone introduced by

the depiction of the competing voices of the *gradatio* by inducing the audience to confess the absurdity of their misplaced loyalty. Obviously, Christ is not divided, nor, as the main clause of the *enthymeme* implies, does Paul or anyone else deserve their loyalty. Only He who was crucified for them, and in whose name they were baptized merits their allegiance.

Thus at the commencement of the argument Paul's argumentative strategy becomes clear. He sets out to show the Corinthians in what respects their behavior is inconsistent with what they and Paul believe. The intended result is that they accept the censure and renew their adherence to the gospel originally preached to them by Paul (4:13-16).

By opting to attack the false estimation of his ministry in Corinth and to discourage those who would use their relationship with him to claim special status within the congregation, Paul puts himself forward as a man of modesty and fairness,[16] while at the same time criticizing, by implication, those who accept the practice. The themes of crucifixion and baptism introduced in the rhetorical questions are dealt with chiastically, and enable Paul to correct false impressions of his baptismal activity before turning to his role as a preacher (v. 17).

Since he is now dealing with the events of his ministry in Corinth, Paul is able to further enhance his ethos by correcting the first statement about his baptismal activity,

"only Crispus and Gaius" (v. 14), by the afterthought about "the household of Stephanus" (v. 16), and by his willingness to be reminded of other names he may have forgotten. The chiastic form of verse sixteen (ἐβάπτισα-ἐβάπτισα) conveys the sense of a subject on which further discussion in unnecessary. Paul has, however, acknowledged and guarded against (*prolepsis*)[17] the erroneous interpretation of his initial ministry in Corinth. The point of view Paul wished to correct or modify is introduced by the indefinite pronoun formula (μη τις εἴπῃ), a device that enables Paul to deal with ideas and behavior that he disapproves of without giving undue prominence to the persons involved.[18]

In verse seventeen he makes the transition to the second topic, his apostolic commission to preach the gospel in a manner that would not nullify its effect. He effects the transition by contrasting in an antithesis the role of baptizer and preacher of the gospel (Βαπτίζειν-εὐαγγελίζεσθαι). The function of the sentence, however, is to elaborate, by negation, on the second term of the antithesis in a typical Pauline collocation, οὐ .... γὰρ . . . ἀλλὰ . . . ἵνα μὴ.[19] He introduces the idea that it is possible to nullify the impact of the preaching of the cross of Christ by the manner in which it is conceptualized or verbalized. For Paul, the meaning of the event and the manner in which it is communicated are integrally related. Paul's original ministry in Corinth and the response of the Corinthians is to be examined

in relation to the message of the cross. In the next section, Paul discusses the reaction to the preaching of the "word of the cross" and returns in 2:1-5 to a discussion of his ministry in Corinth.

1 Corinthians 1:18-31

18. Ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταθρος τοῖς μεν ἀπολλυμένοις μωρία ἐστιν
τοῖς δὲ σωζομένοις ἡμῖν δύναμις θεοῦ ἐστιν.
19. γέγραπται γάρ,
Ἀπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν,
καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν δυνετῶν ἀθετήσω.
20. ποῦ σοφός;
ποῦ γραμματεύς;
ποῦ συζητητης τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου;
οὐχι ἐμώρανεν ὁ θεος τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου;

21. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν τῇ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ
οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν θεόν,
εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεος διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος
σῶσαι τούς πιστεύοντας.

22. ἐπειδὴ καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι σεμεῖα αἰτοῦσιν
καὶ Ἕλληνες σοφίαν ζητοῦσιν,
23. ἡμεῖς δε κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταθρωμένον,
Ἰουδαίοις μεν σκάνδαλον
ἔθνεσιν δε μωρίαν,
24. αυτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς, Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησιν
Χριστον θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν.

25. ὅτι τὸ μωρὸν τοῦ θεοῦ σοφώτερον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστιν,
καὶ τὸ ἀσθενὲς τοῦ θεοῦ ἰσχυρότερον τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

26. Βλέπετε γαρ τὴν κλῆσιν ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί,
ὅτι οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοι κατα σαρκα,
οὐ πολλοὶ δυνατοί,
οὐ πολλοὶ εὐγενεῖς.

27. ἀλλὰ τὰ μωρὰ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεος, ἵνα καταισχύνῃ
τοὺς σοφούς,
καὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεος ἵνα καταισχύνῃ
τὰ ἰσχυρά,
28. καὶ τὰ ἀγενῆ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὰ ἐξουθενημενα ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεος
τὰ μὴ ὄντα, ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ
29. ὅπως μὴ καυχήσηται πᾶσα σαρξ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.
30. ἐξ αὐτοῦ δε ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,
ὃς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ,
δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμὸς καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις,
31. ἵνα καθως γεγραπται,
ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίου καυχάσθω.

1 Corinthians 1:18-31

Antithesis

18. For the word of the cross, to those who are perishing,
is folly
but to us who are being saved it is the *power* of God
19. For it is written, *Appeal to Authority*

I will destroy the *wisdom* of the wise men *Chiasm*
and the cleverness of the clever I will thwart.
20. Where is the wise man? *Anaphora*
Where is the scribe? *Rhetorical Questions*
Where is the scholar of this age? *Accumulation*
Has God not made foolish the *wisdom* of the world?
Distributio
21. For since, the the *wisdom* of God,
the world did not know God through *wisdom*
it pleased God through the *folly* of what we preach
to save those who believe. *Paraphrasis*

22. Since Jews demand signs
and Greeks seek *wisdom*,
but we preach Christ crucified
a stumbling block to Jew
and *folly* to Gentiles, *Paraphrasis*
24. but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks
Christ the *power* of God and the *wisdom* of God.

25. For the *foolishness* of God is wiser than men, *Parallelism*
and the *weakness* of God is stronger than men. *Paradox*

26. For consider your call, brethren;
for there are not many wise men according to the flesh,
not many powerful, *Anaphora*
not many of noble birth, *Accumulation*
Assertion
27. but the *foolishness* of the world, *God* chose to *shame* the
wise
and what is *weak* in the world, *God* chose to *shame* the
strong,
28. and what is low born and despised in the world, *God* chose
even the things that are not to *bring to nothing* things
that are,
29. so that no human being might *boast* in the presence of *God*.

30. From him you are in Christ Jesus, *Accumulation*
who became *wisdom* for us from God,
(who is) righteousness, sanctification, and redemption;

31. therefore it is written, *Appeal to Authority*
"Let him who *boasts*, *boast* in the Lord."

Paul develops his understanding of the gospel through an account of the history of the response to the preaching of "the word of the cross." In the first unit (18-25) he establishes the discussion at a general level by the use of *paraphrasis*: "those who are perishing" (v. 18), "those who are being saved" (v. 18), "those who believe" (v. 21), and "those who are called" (v. 24).

In the initial antithesis (v. 18) Paul sets up the contrast between the perception of the "word of the cross" as "folly" by those who are perishing and the experience of the "word of the cross" as "the power of God" by the Christian community (ἡμῖν v. 18b).

He then appeals to scripture in order to explain the negative response to the preaching of the cross (v. 19). The introductory formula "it is written" and the epigrammatic force lent by the chiastic arrangement fo the verbs (Ἀπολῶ-ἀθετήσω) clearly indicate the important role scripture plays in his argumentative strategy (cf. 1:31; 2:9; 3:19-20).

In the series of rhetorical questions that follows (v. 20) Paul urges his audience to recognize the truth of what has just been asserted in the quotation of scripture, that "God has made foolish the wisdom of the world" (v. 20b).

Paul's strategey is to set up a *distributio*[20] in which he divides the terms wisdom and power. The true wisdom and power are the "word of the cross", "the folly of the kerygma" (v. 21) and "Christ crucified" (v. 23). The false wisdom is

the wisdom of the wise of this world by which men attempt to know God (v. 21). The Jews are impressed by signs (demonstrations of power) but regard the cross as a scandal. The Greeks, operating by the wisdom of the world, regard the preaching of "Christ crucified" as foolishness (vv. 22-23).

Paul concludes the unit by reminding the Corinthians that "the word of the cross," the "power and wisdom of God," contradicts human ideas of wisdom and strength and manifests itself in the world as foolishness and weakness (v. 25).

In the second unit (vv. 26-31) Paul turns to the situation of the Corinthians, and addressing them as "brethren" asks them to consider that, in the community into which they had been called, there were not many wise, powerful, or noble.

Picking up the terms just used Paul describes the congregation as the eschatological community God has chosen (vv. 27-29) to challenge the world's confidence in its wisdom, power, and pride (cf. 6:2). Since God has chosen them in their foolishness, weakness, and lack of status they have nothing to boast of in the presence of the Lord.[21]

The only ground for boasting in the Christian community is in Christ, the wisdom of God (vv. 30-31).

In this section Paul has defined the gospel he and others (ἡμεῖς) (v. 23) were commissioned to preach as "Christ crucified," God's wisdom and power, and the Corinthian community as a concrete illustration of the weakness and foolishness of the gospel. By expanding *accumulation* on the reference to

God (v. 29) Paul gives Christological focus to the quotation that closes the section (cf. 2:16). Thus, in describing the nature of the community and the gifts it has received through Christ, Paul reminds the Corinthians that the only legitimate boasting is boasting in the Lord, who has been defined in the discussion as "Christ crucified," the wisdom and power of God.

1 Corinthians 2:1-5

1. Κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ἦλθον
   οὐ καθ' ὑπεροχὴν λόγου ἢ σοφίας
   καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ θεοῦ.
2. οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινα τι εἰδέναι ἐν ὑμῖν
   εἰ μὴ Ἰησοῦ Χριστὸν καὶ τοῦτον ἐσταυρωμένον.

3. κἀγὼ ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ καὶ ἐν φόβῳ
   καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ πολλῷ
   ἐγενόμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς,

4. καὶ ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά μου
   οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λογοῖς
   ἀλλ' ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως
5. ἵνα ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν μὴ ᾖ ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀνθρώπων
   ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ.

1.	And when I came to *you*, brethren, I came not with lofty words of *wisdom* proclaiming to you the testimony of God.	*Argument by example dependent on ethos*
2.	For I decided to know nothing among *you* except Jesus Christ and him crucified.	
3.	And I in weakness and in much fear and trembling was with *you;*	*Accumulation for ethos*
4.	and my speech and my message were not in plausible words of *wisdom* but in demonstration of the spirit and *power*,	*Antithetical Correctio*
5.	so that your faith might not rest in the *wisdom* of men, but in the *power* of God.	

In his exposition of the gospel (1:18-31) Paul identified with the Christian community, "to us" (v. 18), "we preach" (v. 23) and "for us" (v. 30). In his reference to his ministry in Corinth in 2:1-5 he reverts to a first person narrative, picking up, as it were, where he left off in 1:17. He now clearly distinguishes preacher and audience. The emphatic (Ἐγω)(vv. 1,3), the first person singular verbs, "I decided" (v. 2), " I was with you" (v. 3) contrast with the plural "you" (vv. 1,2,3,5). The reference to the Corinthians as "brethren" again signals Paul's desire to maintain the goodwill of his audience as he begins a new section of the argument.

Paul remind them of his ministry among them and states that he has deliberately limited his preaching to the proclamation of the crucified Christ (v. 2). His preaching, then, "my speech and my message" (v. 4), was consistent with the gospel he had set out in 1:18-31 (cf. 1:23). His strategy, then, is to use his ministry as an argument by example, dependent on ethos.

He proceeds by *accumulation* to assert that both his bearing "in weakness and in much fear and trembling" (v. 3), and his manner of preaching, "not in lofty words of wisdom" (v. 1),"not in plausible words of wisdom" (v. 4), were evidence of his anxiety that the faith of the congregation should be founded on the divine power and not on human wisdom (v. 5).

In the *antithetical correctio* that concludes the section Paul sums up his contention that the goal of his ministry in

Corinth was the spiritual stability of the Corinthians, and that the style of his ministry and the content of his preaching were directed to that end. What is contrasted is human wisdom and divine power. What is rejected is the type of faith engendered by human wisdom and eloquence.

The function of the *antithetical correctio* is oratorical definition, bringing into focus the aspect of the subject the speaker wishes to emphasize. Nevertheless, the contrast between spiritual power and the eloquence of wisdom in 2:4 is also repeated in 1:17; 2:12 and 4:19-20. This would indicate that the concept of wisdom was important for some in the congregation and that they regarded eloquence as one of the gifts and manifestations of wisdom.

1 Corinthians 2:6-16

6. Σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις,
σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου
οὐδὲ τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου
τῶν καταργουμένων

7. ἀλλὰ λαλοῦμεν θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηριῷ
τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην,
ἣν προώρισεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων
εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν.

8. ἣν οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἔγνωκεν,
εἰ γὰρ ἔγνωσαν,
οὐκ ἂν τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν.
9. ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται,

Ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν
καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη,
ἃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.

10. ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεω ὁ θεος διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος.
τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα πάντα ἐραυνᾶ,
καὶ τα βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ.

11. τίς γὰρ εἶδεν ἀνθρώπων τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
εἰ μη τὸ πνεῦμα το τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ
οὕτως καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδεὶς ἔγνωκεν
εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ.

12. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν
ἀλλὰ το πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ,
ἵνα εἰδῶμεν τὰ ὑπο τοῦ θεοῦ
χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν.

13. ἃ καὶ λαλοῦμεν
οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις
ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος.
πνευματακοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες

14. ψυκικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ
μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστιν,
καὶ οὐ δύναται γνῶναι,
ὅτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται.

15. ὁ δὲ πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνει τὰ πάντα,
αὐτὸς δὲ ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἀνακρίνεται
τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου,
16. ὃς συμβιβασει αὐτον;
ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν.

6. Howbeit, we speak *wisdom* among the mature *Antithesis*
but a *wisdom* not of this age *Definition*
nor of the *rulers of this age*,
who are doomed to pass away.

7. But we speak God's *wisdom* in a mystery
the hidden (wisdom) *Accumulation*
which our God decreed before the ages
for our glorification.

8. Which (wisdom) none of the *rulers of this age knew*
for if they *had known*, *Enthymeme*
they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory. *Epithet*
9. But as it is written, *Appeal to Authority*

Things that no eye has seen and no ear heard
and into the heart of man has not entered
things that God has prepared *Accumulation*
for those that love him,

10. But to us God has revealed (them) through the *Spirit*
for the *Spirit* explores all things,
even the depths of God.

11. For who among men *knows* the things of man
except the *spirit* that is in him? *Analogy*
So also the things of God no one *knows*
except the *Spirit* of God.

12. But we have not the *spirit* of the world received
but the *Spirit* of God,
so that we may know the things of God
bestowed upon us. *Antithetical Correctio*

13. Which things we also *speak*
not in words taught by human *wisdom*
but taught by the *Spirit* *Antithetical Correctio*
interpreting spiritual things in spiritual terms.

14. The unspiritual man, however, does not receive the
things of God's *Spirit*
for they are foolishness to him
and he does not understand them *Accumulation*
because they are spiritually *discerned*.

15. The spiritual man, however, *judges* all things,
but is himself *judged* by no one. *Antithesis*

16. "For who has known the *mind* of the Lord, so as to instruct
him?"
We, however, have the *mind* of Christ.

In the next paragraph (2:6-16) Paul again takes up the concept of wisdom and seems to contradict the position he has just taken. In 1:18-2:5 he has divided the term. He rejected the conception of wisdom as the attempt of the human intellect to gain knowledge of God and to communicate that knowledge in an eloquent and convincing manner. To that understanding Paul opposed his understanding of Christ as the content of wisdom. He sites his reliance on divine power and not on rhetorical skill (2:1-4). He now asserts, however, that there is indeed a Christian wisdom: "But we do speak of

a wisdom among the mature" (2:6).

The tension thus created is not resolved within the passage itself, but in 3:1-4, where the limitation he accepted in Corinth, "I determined to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified" (2:2) is presented as a rhetorical strategy which is dictated by the spiritual immaturity of the Corinthian community.

The paragraph also stands out from its context in style, structure, and theology, but in it, as in 1:18-31, Paul develops his understanding of the content of the gospel in the context of the discussion of wisdom within the Corinthian congregation.

One distinguishing feature of the paragraph is the introduction of the language of the mysteries, signalled by the use of the terms "perfect" (τελείοις) (v. 6), "mystery" (μυστηρίῳ) (v. 7), "hidden" (ἀποκεκρυμμένην) (v. 7), and by the repetition of the verbs of perception, "know" (ἔγνωκεν) (vv. 8,11,12), "reveal" (ἀπεκάλυψεν) (v. 10), "search" (ἐραυνᾷ) (v. 10), "discern/judge" (ἀνακρίνεται) (vv. 14,15), and "receive the spirit" (γ. 12). The change in terminology indicates that Paul is dealing with spiritual claims made by members of the congregation and has adopted their language to present his point of view.

Another important feature of the passage is the use of the first person plural of the verbs (vv. 6,7,12 bis, 13) and the plural of the personal pronoun of the first person

(vv. 10,12 bis, 16). The "we" in the verbs of communication (vv. 6,7,13) refer to the proclamation of the gospel by Paul and those associated with him, while the "we" involved in the reception of the gospel and its benefits (vv. 10,12 bis) refers to the Christian community. The closing statement, "but we have the mind of Christ," may, however, anticipate the distinction between spiritual and immature Christians, between those who merely possess the Spirit and those whose behavior is determined by it.

The structure of the passage derives from the two themes introduced in the opening statement, "But we do speak wisdom--among the perfect." Verses 6-9 define what Paul understands by "wisdom," and verses 10-16 elaborate on the role of the Spirit in the reception of wisdom, in communicating it, and on the stance of those who possess it. The passage is given unity by the repetition of the term and by the use of the relative pronoun to link the terms in the discussion in a continuous process of redefinition. The process can be observed as follows:

v. 6	wisdom not of this age
v. 7	wisdom . . . the hidden (wisdom)
v. 7b	which God decreed before the ages
v. 8b	which none of the rulers of this age knew
v. 9	which things no eye has seen or ear heard
v. 9b	things that God has prepared
v. 10	all things
v. 11	the things of God
v. 12	the things given to us by God
v. 13	which things we also speak
v. 14	the things of the Spirit of God
v. 15	all things
v. 16	the mind of Christ

UMI

Johannes Weiss divided the passage into ten stanzas, organized in three groups, 6-9, 10-12, 13-16, each stanza, with the exception of the last (15-16) having three lines. He also noted correspondence between stanzas, such as the relationship between one and three.[22]

The development of the discussion becomes clearer, however, if the passage is arranged in two sections, verses six to nine and ten to sixteen. The scheme of the first group is A B A' B'. A' complements the statement about "the rulers of this age" in verse six, and B' complements the argument in verse seven about the hiddenness of divine wisdom. The linear development of the argument in verses ten to sixteen is supported by a chiastic arrangement, A B C C' B' A'. Verses ten and fifteen/sixteen both deal with the function of the Spirit to perceive and reveal "all things"; verses eleven and fourteen stress man's inability to know the things of God without the aid of the Spirit of God; and verses twelve and thirteen emphasize the role of the Spirit in giving knowledge of the things of God and in communicating them.

The careful arrangement of the paragraph and the use of the terms familiar to the Corinthians constitute a strong ethos argument. Paul's basic strategy, however, is redefinition. This is reflected in the *repetitios*, the use of antithesis and *accumulation*.

The repetition of "wisdom" in verses six to nine, and

"spirit" in ten to fifteen supports the division of the paragraph into two sections, and focuses the discussion.

The antithesis in verse six sets up the contrast between the true wisdom and the wisdom of "the rulers of this age." The accumulation in verses seven and nine emphasizes the hiddenness of God's wisdom and the scriptural quotation underscore man's ignorance of the content of wisdom. Paul's intention to illustrate the hiddenness of God's wisdom prompts the *enthymeme* of verse eight. It runs as follows: Those who know God's wisdom (plan of salvation) would not crucify the Lord of glory. The "rulers of this age" crucified the Lord of glory, hence they did not know God's wisdom.

The reasoning does, of course, raise the problem of why they did crucify Jesus Christ if they were ignorant of God's plan. The *epithetical* "Lord of Glory" does, however, raise the level of abstraction and focuses on the mythological rather than on the historical, and it does make the point that Paul wishes to make; namely, that God's wisdom is not the wisdom of this world.

In verses ten to sixteen Paul continues the process of redefinition in two *correctios*, an analogy, and by setting up the contrast between the "natural" and the "spiritual man."

The analogy in verse eleven introduced by the rhetorical question; "What man knows the things of the spirit of man except the spirit of man that is within him?" attempts to support the contention of verse ten that the Spirit can reveal

UMI

because it investigates the deep things of God.

Since, however, Paul has introduced a parallel between the spirit of man and the Spirit of God (v. 12), he hastens in a *correctio*, expressed in an antithesis between the spirit of the world and the Spirit of God, to guard against the notion that the human spirit may have access to divine knowledge by identifying it with "the spirit of the world."

The *correctio* in verse thirteen asserts that knowledge of the things of God must be communicated in language provided by the Spirit.

The passage concludes with definitions of two types of men, the natural and the spiritual, that summarizes the discussion about the recipients of wisdom (vv. 10-13). Because he does not possess the Spirit, the natural man is constitutionally incapable of receiving or understanding the wisdom of God. But the spiritual man can receive "the things of the Spirit of God," and, consequently, can make spiritual judgments with authority (v. 15).

In support of the spiritual man's claim to independence Paul cites the quotation from Isaiah 40:13: "for who has known the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him?" (Cf. Rom. 11:34). The expression "mind (νοῦν) of the Lord" that no one knows (ἔγνω) picks up the theme of the hidden wisdom of God that "the rulers of this age" did not recognize (v. 8) and the "things of God" that no one could discover (v. 11). The change of "Lord" to "Christ" (16b) changes the level of

UMI

abstraction and completes the process of redefinition. Paul and the Christian community (ἡμεῖς) (v. 16b) have the knowledge the Spirit communicates (v. 12), the "wisdom" that is the content of God's plan (v. 8) which has already defined in 1:18-31, as the crucified Christ, the power and wisdom of God.

The emphatic "we" (v. 16b) also draws attention to an important rhetorical strategy. The Corinthians are not addressed directly, but are given the opportunity to assent to the exposition of the gospel proclaimed by Paul and those associated with him in the ministry (vv. 6,7,13). Those, however, who see themselves as "the perfect" in verse six, learn as the discussion proceeds that the fundamental distinction to be made is between those who have received the Spirit of God and those who have not (v. 12), between the psychikos and the pneumatikos (vv. 14-16). Paul has ruled out the possibility of progress from one to the other (v. 14). Moreover, Paul is about to disturb the complacency of those who identify with the "we" of verse sixteen by adding to the formal distinction between the pneumatikos and the psychikos the qualitative distinction between the mature and the immature, between the pneumatic and "the babes in Christ" (3:1).

1 Corinthians 3:1-4

1. Κἀγώ ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἠδύνηθην λαλῆσαι ὑμῖν
ὡς πνευματικοῖς
ἀλλ᾽ ὡς σαρκίνοις,
ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ.

2. γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα,
οὔπω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε.
ἀλλ' οὐδε ἔτι νῦν δύνασθε,
3. ἔτι γὰρ σαρκικοί ἐστε.

4. ὅπου γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν ζῆλος καὶ ἔρις,
οὐχὶ σαρκικοί ἐστε
καὶ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε;

ὅταν γὰρ λέγῃ τις,
Ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου,
ἕτερος δέ, Ἐγὼ Ἀπολλῶ,
οὐκ ἄνθρωποί ἐστε;

1. But I, brethren, *could not* address you
as spiritual men,
but as *men of the flesh*, *Antithetical Correctio*
as babes in Christ.

2. I fed you on milk, not on solid food
for you were *not yet able* to take it;
and indeed, you *are not able* to take it even now
3. for you are still *of the flesh*.
Enthymeme

4. For since there is still among you jealousy and strife,
are you not of the flesh? *Rhetorical Question*
And do you not behave like *ordinary men*?

For when one says, *Enthymeme*
"I belong to Paul" *Pathos appeal*
and another says, *through ethos*
"I belong to Apollos," *Rhetorical*
are you not *mere men*? *Question*

The change to the first person singular with the emphatic (Κἀγώ)(vv. 1,2) signals the return to the discussion of Paul's ministry in Corinth and the limitation imposed on his preaching. In 2:1-5 the limitation was attributed to Paul's desire that the faith of the community rest on the power of God and not on man's wisdom (2:5), but now Paul argues that the wisdom preached among "the perfect" could not be shared with the Corinthians.

Those of his audience who identified themselves as the pneumatics of 2:15, and claimed to possess "the mind of Christ" (2:16b) are now plainly told that they could not be addressed as spiritual men (3:1). Paul sets up a new antithesis with pneumatikoi and, in a series of synonymous terms, develops the negative side of the antithesis to characterize the Corinthians.

They were "fleshly" (σαρκίνοις), "babes in Christ" (νηπίος ἐν Χριστῷ), "of the flesh" (σαρκικοί). They "behave in a human manner" (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε), and were "mere men" (ἄνθρωποί). Whereas in 2:6-16 Paul has demonstrated that the natural man cannot develop into a spiritual man (2:14), he now shows that the spiritual man can think and act like the natural man.

Paul supports the designation of the Corinthians as "babes in Christ," itself a *correctio*, a mitigating gloss, on "men of the flesh" (σαπκίνοις), by the employment of the metaphor, "I fed you milk, not solid food," that stresses their inability to receive the advanced instruction available to the mature (2:6-16).

Paul makes the transition from his original ministry to the present situation in the congregation by arguing that they have not progressed beyond their original immaturity (v. 2). He offers proof of their immaturity in two *enthymemes* (vv. 3-4).

In the first, he points to the presence of strife and envy in the congregation. In the second, he becomes more specific, following the pattern of 1:10-12, and cites their allegiance to himself and Apollos as evidence that they are operating on a human level.

The *enthymemes* give the impression of reasonableness in Paul's dealing with the Corinthians, but they function rhetorically as an appeal using *ethos*. The assent to the rhetorical question (vv. 3-4) is more than agreement with Paul's logic, it is the acceptance of Paul's trustworthiness and an admission of their own immaturity. The repetition of the synonyms for man and the four instances of the verb "to be able" have enabled Paul to turn criticism of the inadequacy of his ministry in Corinth into a confession on the part of his audience of their own immaturity. Paul's argument here is, in effect, that "the audience has the major role in determining the quality of the argument" presented to it (cf. 9:9-19).

1 Corinthians 3:5-17

5. Τί οὖν ἐστιν Ἀπολλῶς;
τί δὲ ἐστιν Παῦλος;
διάκονοι δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε,
καὶ ἑκάστῳ ὡς ὁ κύριος ἔδωκεν.

6. ἐγω ἐφύτευσα,
Ἀπολλῶς ἐπότισεν,
ἀλλὰ ὁ θεος ηὔξανεν.
7. ὥστε οὔτε ὁ φυτεύων ἐστίν τι
οὔτε ὁ ποτίζων
αλλ' ὁ αὐξάνων θεός.

8. ὁ φυτεύων δὲ καὶ ὁ ποτίζων ἓν εἰσιν,
ἕκαστος δὲ τὸν ἴδιον μισθὸν λήψεται
κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον κόπον.

9. θεοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν συνεργοί.
θεοῦ γεώργιον,
θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε.

10. Κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι
ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἔθηκα,
ἄλλος δὲ ἐποικοδομεῖ.
ἕκαστος δὲ βλεπέτω πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ.
11. θεμέλιον γὰρ ἄλλον οὐδεὶς δύναται θεῖναι
παρὰ τὸν κείμενον, ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.

12. εἰ δε τις ἐποικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον
χρυσον, αργυρον, λιθους τιμιους, ξυλα, χορτον, καλαμην,
13. ἑκάστου τὸ ἔργον φανερὸν γενήσεται,
ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα δηλώσει. ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται,
καὶ ἑκαστου το ἔργον ὁποῖον ἐστιν τὸ πῦρ αὐτὸ δοκιμάσει.

14. εἴ τινος τὸ ἔργον μενεῖ ὁ ἐποικοδόμησεν, μισθὸν λεμψεται.
15. εἴ τινος τὸ ἔργον κατακαήσεται, ζημιωθήσεται,
αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός.

16. οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν;
17. εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φθείρει,
φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θεός.
ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν,
οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς.

5. What then is Apollos?
And what is Paul?
Servants through whom you believed,
and to each as the Lord gave.

6. I planted, *Analogy*
Apollos watered,
but *God* gave the increase. *Gradatic Antithesis*
7. So that neither he who plants is anything
nor he who waters,
but *God* who gives the increase.

8. Now he who plants and he who waters are equal,
and each shall receive *his own reward*
according to *his own labor*.

9. For *God's* fellow workers are we; *Anaphora*
God's field
God's building are you.

10. According to the commission of God given to me, *Ethos*
like a skilled master builder, a *foundation I laid*,
and another man is *building upon* it. *Analogy*
Let each man take care how he *builds upon* it.
11. For no other *foundation can anyone lay*
than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.

12. Now if anyone *builds on the foundation*
with gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble,
13. each man's work will become manifest;
for the Day will disclose it, because it will be revealed
with *fire*,
and what sort of *work each* has done, the *fire* will test it.
14. If anyone's *work* survives which he has built he shall
receive a reward.
If anyone's *work* shall be burned down, he shall suffer loss,
But he himself shall be saved, but only as through *fire*.

16. Do you not know that you are *God's temple* *Rhetorical*
and that the Spirit of *God* dwells in you? *Question*
17. If anyone destroys *God's temple*,
God will destroy him.
For *God's temple* is holy,
and that *temple* you are.

In 3:5-17 Paul instructs the Corinthians in the proper attitude towards those who worked among them, using himself and Apollos and an unidentified worker (v. 10) as examples.

Paul's problem is to relate his ministry in Corinth to the ministry of those that followed him in such a way that would assert his solidarity with them and yet preserve the independence of each worker. He uses two analogies to expand on his initial designation of himself and Apollos as "servants." The analogies of the church as God's field (γεώργιον)(vv. 5-9), and as God's building (οἰκοδομή) (vv. 10-15) enable Paul to stress the responsibility of the worker to his master, the interdependence of their work, and the equal status of the workers. The paragraph ends with an exhortation to the Corinthians on the need to recapture a proper understanding of themselves as the temple of God.

A series of *repetitios* emphasize the unity of the theme and binds the structure together. The triple repetition of the divine name in *anaphora* (v. 9) corresponds to the five instances of "God" in verses sixteen and seventeen. The insistence on individual responsibility is conveyed by the five occurrences of "each" (ἕκαστος) (vv. 5,8,10,13 bis). The belief that each man shall receive his reward according to the work he has done is stated in verses eight and fourteen.

The horticultural analogy enables Paul to stress the continuity between his original ministry and the ministry of Apollos, while at the same time removing ground for boasting by asserting in the *gradatio antithesis* that the success they achieved in their respective roles of planter and nurturer must be attributed to God who assigned the roles

in the first place (v. 5). He is also careful to point out that while they are to be equally regarded by the church at Corinth (v. 8) their reward is to be commensurate with the performance of their assigned tasks. The distinction between planter and waterer quietly reminds the Corinthians of the historical priority of his ministry, a fact he makes use of later in the argument (4:15-16).

In the analogy of the building Paul asserts his commission to build the foundation (v. 10) and emphatically asserts that Jesus Christ is the only foundation on which those who followed him in Corinth should build (v. 11).

The apocalyptic imagery (vv. 12-15) of "the Day" and "fire" reinforced by the verbs of revelation in the future tense (φανερὸν γενήσεται, δηλώσει, ἀποκαλύπτεται, δοκιμάσει) develop the injunction on the need for care in the manner of building (v. 10). The function of this eschatological language is to remind the Corinthians that the work of Christian leaders will be subject to judgment. Therefore, invidious comparisons between Paul and Apollos and others is inappropriate. Judgment is divine prerogative.

As in 1:4-9, the use of eschatological imagery also functions to place the Corinthian's behavior, especially their propensity to identify with particular leaders, in the light of future judgment. It exercises a *pathos* appeal and is designed to make them receptive to the suggestions Paul makes in the next section of the argument.

The rhetorical question,"Know you not that you are God's temple?", reestablishes direct contact with the audience and signals the close of the paragraph. It introduces another analogy, organized chiastically, in which Paul again sets out the relationship between the church and its leaders.

The outer members of the chiasm instruct the community how to regard themselves; they are the temple of God, which is indwelt by the Spirit of God (A B); since the temple of God is holy, the Christian community is holy (B' A'). The pivotal statement C, introduced by the εἴ τις formula (cf. 12, 14,15), reaffirms the belief that God (in the emphatic position) will destroy the person who destroys the Christian community.

Paul's answer, then, to his initial question about the role of Apollos and himself and to the practice of identification with Christian leaders that lay behind it was to place the workers and the community in relation to God. He appoints the workers, assigns the tasks, and will reward each of them (ἕκαστος)(vv. 5,8,10,13) according to the diligence shown (κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον κόπον) (vv. 8,14). The Corinthian congregation is the sphere in which these leaders work, God's field, God's building. Anyone who sets out to destroy the community, God's temple, will be judged by God, not the Corinthians.

1 Corinthians 3:18-23

18. Μηδεὶς ἑαυτὸν ἐξαπατάτω.
εἴ τις δοκεῖ εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ
μωρὸς γενέσθω, ἵνα γένηται σοφός.

19. ἡ γὰρ σοφία τοῦ κόσμου τούτου
μωρία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ἐστιν.
γέγραπται γαρ,
ὁ δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν.
20. καὶ πάλιν
Κύριος γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς τῶν σοφῶν,
ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι.
21. ὥστε μηδεὶς καυχάσθω ἐν ἀνθρώποις.

πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν,
22. εἴτε Παῦλος εἴτε Ἀπολλῶς εἴτε Κηφᾶς
εἴτε κόσμος εἴτε ζωὴ εἴτε θάνατος
εἴτε ἐνεστῶτα εἴτε μέλλοντα,
πάντα ὑμῶν,
23. ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ, Χριστος δὲ θεοῦ.

18. Let no one deceive himself.
If any one among you thinks that he is *wise* in this age,
let him become a *fool*, that he may become *wise*. *Paradox*

19. For the wisdom of this world is *folly* with God.
For it is written,
"He catches the *wise* in their craftiness,"
20. and again,
"The Lord knows that the thoughts of the *wise* are futile."
21. So let no one boast of men.

For all things are yours, *Inclusio*
22. whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas *Gradatio*
or the world or life or death
or the present or the future *Accumulation*
all are yours;
23, and you are Christ's; and Christ is God's.

Paul returns in this paragraph to the themes of boasting of men and confidence in human wisdom introduced in 1:12ff. Those in the congregation who demonstrate their supposed wisdom by identifying with a particular Christian leader are again reminded of the futility of human wisdom (cf. 1:18-31) and of the paradox that the foolishness of God is wiser than men (v. 18: cf. 1:25). He cites two scriptural texts as authority for this statement that recall the texts cited in 1:19

and act as an *inclusio* for this part of the argument.

The remedy for this way of thinking is set out in a carefully constructed *gradatio*, reinforced by *anaphora* and an *inclusio*. The Corinthians do not belong to the apostles; rather the apostles and "all things" belong to the Corinthians. This is essentially a restatement and expansion of the point made in the analogy of the church as God's field (3:5-9).

The *accumulation*, which expands on the meaning of "all things" (vv. 21-22), extends beyond the strict requirements of the argument about the proper attitude to the apostles and serves to increase the self-esteem of the congregation. They need not be dominated by Christian leaders (cf. 2 Cor. 11:19-21) or the vicissitudes of human existence, present or future, so long as they recognize their subordination to Christ, who, in turn, is subject to God (cf. 1 Cor. 11:3; 15:28).

The use of the divine names signals the close of the paragraph, and the repetition of the four names introduced in 1:12 indicates that an important stage has been reached in the discussion.

1 Corinthians 4:1-5

1. οὕτως ἡμᾶς λογίζέσθω ἄνθρωπος
   ὡς ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ
   καὶ οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ.
2. ὧδε λοιπὸν ζητεῖται ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμοις
   ἵνα πιστός τις εὑρεθῇ.

3. ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστον ἐστιν
ἵνα ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἢ ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας.
ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐμαυτὸν ἀνακρίνω.
4. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ σύνοιδα,
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι
ὁ δὲ ἀνακρίνων με κύριός ἐστιν.

5. ὥστε μὴ πρὸ καιροῦ τι κρίνετε ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος,
ὃς καὶ φωτίσει τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους
καὶ φανερώσει τὰς βουλὰς τῶν καρδιῶν.
καὶ τότε ὁ ἔπαινος γενήσεται ἑκάστῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ.

1. This is how one should regard us,
as *servants* of Christ — *Synonymia*
and *stewards* of the mysteries of God.
2. Moreover it is required of *stewards* — *Transition*
that they be found faithful.

3. But with me it is a very small thing
that I should be judged by you or by any human court.
I do not even pass judgment on myself.
4. I am not aware of anything against myself,
but I am not thereby aquitted. — *Antitheses*
It is the Lord who *judges* me.
Enthymeme
5. Therefore do not *pronounce judgment* before the time,
before the Lord comes
who will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness
and will disclose the purposes of the heart.
Then every man will receive his commendation from God.

The vocabulary of evaluation, the repetition of κρίνω and compounds (vv. 3,4, 5), "found faithful" (v. 2), "aware of anything against myself" (v. 4), "acquitted" (v. 4), "bring to light" (v. 5), "disclose" (v. 5) and "commendation" (v. 5), adequately indicates the major concern of the paragraph, Paul's reaction to criticism of his ministry.

Paul returns to the question of the role of Christian leaders that he has treated in 3:5-17 and alluded to in 3:23, but makes the transition to his real subject, the Corinthians

propensity to contest his apostolic authority, by offering a definition of the essential characteristics of the good steward: "that he be found faithful" (v. 2).

He professes indifference to the judgment passed on him by the Corinthians or any human authority and again insists on the individual responsibility of the apostles to the Lord (v. 4b). He is not to be judged by the Corinthians or even by his own conscience. He warns them that evaluation of his work is premature and inappropriate. The implicit premise in the *enthymeme*, he who has the power or authority will do the judging, denies the Corinthians, the right to judge Paul or other Christian leaders.

While Paul has argued that the Christian leadership belongs to the church (3:22), he emphatically denies the Corinthians the right to pass judgment on the faithfulness of the servants of Christ. Only at eschaton, will "each" Christian leader and member of the congregation receive his commendation--or censure--from God (v. 5). The pervasive eschatological imagery with the emphasis in the couplet on the light/dark motif, φωτίσει- φαωερώσει, again places the Corinthians in an eschatological context, and thus maintains the emotional tone of the argumentation.

1 Corinthians 4:6-13

6. Ταῦτα δὲ, ἀδελφοί, μετεσχημάτισα εἰς ἐμαυτὸν
καὶ Ἀπολλῶν δι' ὑμᾶς,
ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ Μη ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται,
ἵνα μὴ εἷς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνος φθσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου.

7. τίς γάρ σε διακρίνει;
τί δὲ ἔχεις ὃ οὐκ ἔλαβες;
εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔλαβες,
τί καυχᾶσαι ὡς μὴ λαβών;

8. ἤδη κεκορεσμένοι ἐστε
ἤδη ἐπλουτήσατε,
χωρὶς ἡμῶν ἐβασιλεύσατε,
καὶ ὄφελόν γε ἐβασιλεύσατε,
ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν συμβασιλεύσωμεν.
9. δοκῶ γάρ ὁ θεος ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐσχάτους ἀπέδειξεν
ὡς ἐπιθανατίους,
ὅτι θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις.

10. ἡμεῖς μωροὶ διὰ Χριστόν
ὑμεῖς δὲ φρόνιμοι ἐν Χριστῷ
ἡμεῖς ἀσθενεῖς,
ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰσχυροί
ὑμεῖς ἔνδοξοι
ἡμεῖς δὲ ἄτιμοι.

11. ἄχρι τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας
καὶ πεινῶμεν
καὶ διψῶμεν
καὶ γυμνιτεύομεν
καὶ κολαφιζόμεθα
καὶ ἀστατοῦμεν
12. καὶ κοπιῶμεν ἐργαζόμενοι ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσίν.
λοιδορούμενοι εὐλογοῦμεν
διωκόμενοι ἀνεχόμεθα
13. δυσφημούμενοι παρακαλοῦμεν.
ὡς περικαθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐγενήθημεν,
πάντων περίψημα
ἕως ἄρτι.

6. All this, brethren, I have applied to myself *Ethos*
and Apollos for your benefit,
that you may learn by us to live according to scripture
that none of you be puffed up in favor of one against the other.

7. For who sees anything different in you? *Enthymeme*
What have you that you did not *receive*? *Rhetorical Question*
If then you *received* it, why do you boast as if it were not a *gift*?

8. Already you are filled! *Gradatio*
Already you have become rich!
Without us you have *become kings!* *Anaphora*
And would that you did *reign*
so that we might *share the reign with you!*
9. For I think God has exhibited us apostles as last of all,
like men sentenced to death, *Analogy*
because we have become a spectacle to the world, to angels
and men.

10. We are fools for Christ's sake *Antitheses*
but you are wise in Christ. *Argument by*
We are weak *paradoxical*
but you are strong. *example*
You are held in honor,
but we in disrepute.

11. *To this very hour* *Inclusio*
we hunger and thirst
we are ill-clad *Polysyndeton*
we are beaten
we are homeless,
12. and we labor, working with our own hands.
When riviled, we bless, *Asyndeton*
when persecuted, we endure,
13. when slandered, we try to conciliate;
we have become the refuse of the world,
the offscouring of all things *Analogy*
until now.

In 4:1-5 Paul has argued that he and Apollos and others, as servants and stewards of the mysteries of God, were responsible to God and would be rewarded at the Coming of the Lord (v. 5). Evaluation by the Corinthians or his own conscience were irrelevant since the Lord was to be the judge (v. 5) He goes on to explain that the reason he has subjected his own ministry and that of Apollos to critical scrutiny was to enable the Corinthians to draw the necessary conclusions about their propensity to identify with one Christian leader at the expense of others (v. 6b).

The rhetorical strategy of discussing his own ministry

and that of Apollos in connection with the practice of identifying with individual Christian leaders had cast the audience, for the most part, as judges. A direct attack at the beginning of the argument would have alienated them, but now the time has come for "the brethren" (v. 6) to draw the appropriate conclusions about their own behavior: "that you might learn by us."

The sense of superiority (φυσιοῦσθε) (v. 6) that revealed itself in the identification with particular leaders (v. 6) now elicits the biting attack that concludes the main section of the argument (7-13).

Switching to the singular, Paul heightens the impact of the rhetorical questions that point out enthymemically the absurdity of boasting of abilities they had received (tris) as gifts, by addressing, as it were, each individual member of the congregation (v. 7).

In verses 8-13 Paul arguing by paradoxical example, sets up a series of ironic contrasts between the elevated stance of the Corinthians and the lowly condition of the apostles.[23]

In a *gradatio*, "filled" (κεκορεσμένοι), "become rich" (ἐπλουτήσατε), "have become kings" (ἐβασιλεύσατε), Paul sets out the claims the Corinthians made about their present (ἤδη) spiritual attainments (v. 8).

He concedes, ironically, that he would like to share in such blessings, but denies their claim, "would that you did reign" (v. 8). In contrast to the imagined elevation of the

Corinthians, Paul portrays the experience of the apostles as equivalent to prisoners brought into the arena to die, a spectacle to the temporal and spiritual worlds (v. 9).

In verse ten Paul sets up a series of antitheses contrasting "the wisdom in Christ", strength, and public esteem the Corinthians enjoy with the position of the apostles, who are fools in Christ, weak, and disreputable in the eyes of men. The pronouns emphasize the contrast, and the last pair are transposed to achieve a smooth transition to the trials of the apostolic life that follows.

The phrases ἄχρι τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας (v. 11) and ἕως ἄρτι (v. 13) form an *inclusio*, and also contrast the present apostolic experience with the self-satisfied attitude of the Corinthians. The sixfold repetition of καὶ lends emphasis to the list of indignities the apostles encounter in their work, while the three pairs of participle-verb combinations, in asyndeton (12-13), emphasize their positive response to the opposition they encounter in preaching the gospel: "we bless," "we endure," "we attempt to conciliate."

The analogy that concludes the paragraph, depicting the apostles as "the world's garbage," "the scum of the earth," with the repetition of κόσμος recalling the analogy of verse nine, again points up the contrast between the world's low opinion of the mission of the apostles and the admiration the spirituality of the Corinthians commands.

1 Corinthians 4:14-21

14. Οὐκ ἐντρέπων ὑμᾶς γράφω ταῦτα,
ἀλλ' ὡς τέκνα μου ἀγαπητὰ νουθετῶν.
15. ἐαν γὰρ μυρίους παιδαγωγοὺς ἔχητε ἐν Χριστῷ,
ἀλλ' οὐ πολλοὺς πατέρας,
ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου
ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγέννησα.
16. παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε.

17. διὰ τοῦτο ἔπεμψα ὑμῖν Τιμόθεον,
ὅς ἐστιν μου τέκνον ἀγαπητὸν καὶ πιστὸν ἐν κυρίῳ
ὅς ὑμᾶς ἀναμνήσει τὰς ὁδούς μου τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,
καθὼς πανταχοῦ ἐν πάσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ διδάσκω.

18. ὡς μὴ ἐρχομένου δέ μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐφυσιώθησάν τινες.
19. ἐλεύσομαι δὲ ταχέως πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἐαν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ,
καὶ γνώσομαι οὐ τὸν λόγον τῶν πεφυσιωμένων
ἀλλὰ τὴν δύναμιν,
20. οὐ γὰρ ἐν λόγῳ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει.
21. τί θέλετε;
ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς,
ἢ ἐν ἀγάπῃ πνεύματί τε πραΰτητος;

14. Not to make *you* ashamed I write these things, *Ethos*
but as my *beloved children* to admonish you. *Epidiorthosis*
15. Even if you have countless guardians in Christ, *Antithesis*
for in Christ Jesus through the gospel
I became *your* father. *Pathos*
16. I beseech *you*, then, be imitators of me.

17. For this purpose I sent *to you* Timothy,
who is *my beloved son* in the Lord
who will remind *you* of my ways in Christ,
as I teach them everywhere in every church. *Alliteration*

18. Some of *you* have become arrogant, as though I were not coming *to you*
19. but I will come *to you* soon, if the Lord wills,
and I will find out not the *talk* of these *arrogant people* but their *power*.
20 For the kingdom of God does not consist in *talk* but in *power*.
21. What do you wish? *Antithetical Correctio*
Shall I come *to you* with a rod, *Rhetorical Question*
or with love in the spirit of gentleness? *Antithesis*
Enthymeme

Verses 14-21 form the conclusion of the argument and also function as a *peroration* in which Paul attempts to regain the goodwill of the congregation and presents his solution to the problem of disunity introduced in 1:10. The frequent repetition of the second person plural pronoun (vv. 14,15,16, 17, bis, 18,19,21), his sending of Timothy (v. 17), and his promise to come to Corinth (18-19) stress that his attack on their superior attitude toward the apostles (4:8-13) is not to be understood as an attempt to humiliate them (ἐντρέπων) but as a positive concern (νουθετῶν) of a father for "his beloved children" (v. 14).

The special relationship between the evangelist and converts that Paul had asserted earlier in the analogies of the planter and waterer, the one who lays the foundation and the person who builds upon it, is now presented as the basis for his request that they imitate him (v. 16).

His sending of Timothy, who also stands in the same relationship to Paul, "a beloved son in the Lord," is to enable the Corinthians to imitate Paul by reminding them (ἀναμνήσει) of Paul's style of life in Christ (τας ὁδούς μου τας ἐν Χριστῷ). He also stresses a point already made in the ecumenical clause in 1:2, that what Timothy will recall for them is no different from the teaching Paul has given in all his churches, an idea emphasized by alliteration, καθως πανταχου ἐν πάσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ διδάσκω(v. 17).

Paul isolates a group within the congregation, the

arrogant (τῶν πεφυσιωμένων) (v. 19), who in Paul's absence are no longer constrained by the controls exerted on the congregation by "the ways of Paul." In a *correctio*, Paul contrasts the talk (λόγον) of these people with his spiritual power (δύναμιν). In the rhetorical question which closes the argument, Paul demands that they either submit to his authority or face humiliation, an authority statement recalling the shame-admonish (ἐντρέπων-νουθετῶν) antithesis of verse fourteen.

The *pathos* appeal is expressed in the use of familial imagery (v. 14-17). The reference to "the arrogant" also raises the emotional level and provides the Corinthians with an opportunity to side with Paul. To assent to the final rhetorical question (v. 21) is to grant the implied premise of the *enthymeme*: He who has authority can offer a choice between praise and censure.

Results

A survey of the results of the analysis of the textual rhetoric of 1 Corinthians will demonstrate that the primary mode of appeal was *pathos*. The direct appeal to the emotions of the audience is also reinforced throughout the argumentation by a series of *ethos* moves through which Paul sought to direct the current of emotion in his favor.

The frequent references to his original ministry in Corinth (1:16-17; 2:1-5; 3:1-4,5-11; 4:1-6) serve as proof of his faithfulness to his apostolic commission and of his

abiding concern that the faith of the Corinthians should rest on the proper foundation (cf. 2:5; 3:10). They also call to mind an earlier, and presumably happier stage in their relationship (4:16).

The eschatological references placed at the beginning of the argument (1:7-9) are again emphasized in 3:5-15 through the use of the themes of reward and loss, building and destruction. In rejecting the Corinthians right to judge him and other Christian leaders (3:17; 4:1-5) Paul also places himself and the Corinthians in the context of the judgment to be revealed at the Parousia. As in 3:12-15, present behavior was considered in the light of divine judgment; thus the emotional appeal exercised by the eschatological language is maintained throughout the argument.

Emotional tone is also maintained by the use of rhetorical questions (1:13 tris; 3:3,4,16; 4:21), often in the form of an *enthymeme*, exposing the inconsistency of the behavior of the Corinthians.

The "parakalo" periods (1:10; 4:16) and the frequent exhortations (1:26,31; 3:10,18,21; 4:5) reveal Paul's sympathetic and positive stance towards the congregation. His intention is not to humiliate but to bring them into obedience to the gospel (4:6,14). Thus he indicates the emotional response he looks for from his audience. This is especially relevant in the ironic contrast between the Corinthians and the apostles at the close of the body of the argument (4:6-13).

Paul attempts throughout the argument to retain the goodwill of the Corinthians by addressing them as "brethren" (1:10,26; 2:1; 3:1; 4:6; 4:14). When introducing the report from Chloe's people he calls them "my brethren" and in the conclusion of the argumentation he changes the mode of address to the more intimate "my beloved children" (4:14).

The use of "brethren" in this way also reveals Paul's intention to address the total congregation. This fact, together with the strong appeal to the emotions of the Corinthians, demonstrates that Paul's intention is not forensic. He is not primarily concerned with attacking and refuting the arguments of his opponents. His intention is to renew and increase the intensity of the Corinthians' adherence to the gospel and to persuade them to allow their thinking and behavior to be shaped by it.

This is not to say that there is no "logos" appeal. In 1:18-31 and 2:6-16 Paul sets out to expound his understanding of the gospel, but his purpose is to show how his ministry and the Corinthian congregation were defined by the "word of the cross" which he and others had preached. In the process he rejects the concept of wisdom that prompted the overvaluation of particular Christian leaders and the extravagant claims to spiritual experience (4:6-13).

Paul raises the emotional level of the argumentation in the conclusion (4:14-21) by the use of familial imagery, the

statement of his intention to visit the congregation, his attack on "the arrogant", and in the final rhetorical question concludes the argument (4:21).

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

1. On the relationship between textual and structural rhetoric, see Brandt, *Rhetoric*, pp. 19-23, 99-116. The considerations affecting the order in which an author presents his arguments in persuasive discourse are discussed in Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, pp. 490-508.

2. A perceptive study by Barbara Herrnstein Smith, *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1968), contains a discussion of closural devices, formal and thematic, that poets use in bringing the argument of a poem to an end. Of relevance for the study of the oral features of Paul's style are her remarks on paratactic, sequential and associative structures, pp. 96-139, and her observations on the employment of parallelism, antithesis, and unqualified assertion, pp. 168-182. Paul's use of the divine names is comparable to what she argues regarding the closural function of "summative words," pp. 163-166. She gives examples of words that are repeated throughout a poem that have a "summative" relation to the poem when they appear in the concluding line. Compare, for example, the summative and closural force of "we have the mind of Christ" (2:16); "and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's"(3:23); "then every man will receive his commendation from God" (4:5); "you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of God" (6:11). On the use of "word clusters" to determine the subunits of the body of the Pauline letter, see James Fischer, C. M., "Pauline Literary Forms and Thought Patterns," *CBQ* 39 (April 1977): 209-223. He cites as examples, the repetition of "call" in 1 Cor. 7:15-24 and "law" in 1 Cor. 9:19-23. Fischer fails, however, to relate these observations to Paul's argumentative intention.

3. The terminology to be adopted in the textual and structural analyses is that used in Brandt, *Rhetoric*. See, in particular, the discussion of the rhetorical function of the various figures of speech in chapter five.

4. Each writer must define himself for his audience, he cannot escape the responsibility of indicating to to his hearers how he wishes to be regarded. He may present himself as "a poor country lawyer" or "your president," but the choice is inescapable. Paul presents himself as an apostle of Jesus Christ and adopts the stance that relationship to the audience permits. Cf. the *ethos* selected in the letter to Philemon.

5. *Repetitio* is the term used to indicate the repetition of a word or phrase, often in parallel syntactical structures. Rhetoricians have evolved a variety of terms to describe the repetition of a word or phrase at different places in the

sentence. In this study the *repetitios* will be underlined, and their function will be discussed in the textual analysis. On the function of repetition, see Brandt, *Rhetoric*, pp.168-9, and Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, pp. 174-176.

6. *Accumulation* is the term used to describe the repetition of an idea in two or more clauses or sentences. Its major function is to give substance to an idea, since the importance of the ideas in a discourse are not related to the number of words needed to express them.

7. *Paraphrasis* is a kind of substitution, usually the substitution of a more elaborate expression for the simple and the concrete. Its function is often to elevate discourse. See Brandt, *Rhetoric*, pp. 166-7 and Quintilian *Instit. Orat.*, 8. 5.59-61.

8. A *Correctio* involves the qualification of a word or phrase by the addition of an expression felt to be more appropriate. Here it is the correction of the phrase "our Lord Jesus Christ" by the more ecumenical, Lord "of them and us."

9. Brandt, *Rhetoric*, p. 158, defines a litotes as a kind of understatement, often functioning as a stance figure, whereby a speaker maintains a sympathetic relationship with his audience. More narrowly defined it is an affirmation by the denial of the contrary. Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, pp. 290-292, in commenting on the relation of the hyperbole to the litotes, notes that the function of the hyperbole is often to prepare for the litotes, whose purpose might otherwise be missed. The purpose, then of the combination of the hyperbole and litotes in vv. 5-7 is to emphasize not merely the possession of gifts but the attitude toward the gifts.

10. Michael Osborn's discussion of the rhetorical function of imagery at different junctures in a speech, "Archetypal Metaphors in Rhetoric," in *Methods of Rhetorical Criticism*, Robert L. Scott and Bernard L. Brock, eds. (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), pp. 383-399.

11. Schubert, *Thanksgivings*, p. 37.

12. An *epithet* is a noun, qualified by one or more adjectives, or by nouns in apposition. Its purpose is to emphasize a quality or characteristic that completes our knowledge of the object. It is used without justification because it is supposed to set out unquestionable facts. Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, pp. 126-7, cites as an example its use in inserting an individual into a class, "Orestes, the murderer." By describing Sosthenes as "our brother" Paul emphasizes his relationship to himself and to the community. Likewise, the epithetical

"God our Father," stresses, by the use of familial imagery (cf. v. 9), the cohesiveness of the group.

13. Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, p. 167, citing the definition in *Ad Herennium*, 4. 68.

14. A *Gradatio* is a figure which advances from one statement to another until it reaches a climax. A good example is cited by Burke, *Rhetoric of Motives*, p. 58: "Who controls Berlin controls Germany; who controls Germany controls Europe; who controls Europe controls the world." To describe verse twelve as a *gradatio* raises the problem of the inclusion of "Christ" in the list. Since there is no manuscript support for dropping it from the list, and the *anaphora* and the *paronomasia* support its inclusion, what Paul is objecting to is probably the profession of allegiance to Christ in the same spirit that animated the professions of loyalty to other leaders.

15. Much of the exegesis on these chapters has been directed to the delineation of the theological profiles of the parties represented by the slogans. The rhetorical error in this procedure is to treat verse twelve as a *partitio*, a forecast of the divisions of the argument, and not as a *narratio*, a statement of the facts relevant to the argument--and to Paul's rhetorical strategy.

16. An *enthymeme* is a syllogism with a premise omitted, most often the major premise. Its function in argument is to support a more concrete statement by the appeal to a higher level of abstraction. An awareness of the implicit premises in argumentation is important, because it reveals what the speaker believes to be the common ground he shares with his audience. For a discussion with examples, see Brandt, *Rhetoric*, pp. 120-3 and Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1. 1.1335a, 2. 22.1395b.

17. As an element of the structure of an oration, *prolepsis* is the interruption of the discourse to answer objections that might be raised. In textual rhetoric it is a figure of speech by which the speaker introduces objections into his sentence in order to answer them. Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, p. 169, notes that the objections may be imaginary, and that it can be relevant to the argumentative strategy to show that the possible objections had been foreseen and taken into account.

18. Cf. 1 Cor. 15:12,34. 2 Cor. 3:1; 10:2,12; Gal. 1:7.

19. Schneider, *Antitheses*, pp. 47-52, defines this type of antithesis as a *correctio* and regards Paul's use of this figure as an important clue to the divine-human contrast central to his theology. Brandt, *Rhetoric*, p. 161, argues

that an antithesis not only emphasizes by way of contrast but it also contributes to definition: "When I say, not this, but that, I am not merely emphasizing a difference, I am setting up a class within which a distinction is being made, and hence I am significantly contributing to the concept by the alternatives I reject."

20. A *distributio* is the division of a concept and an apportioning of its parts, or a rejection of one of them. Its function is normally to define or redefine. Once the division (of wisdom) has been made and the parts assigned, the *distributio* is repeated in the antitheses that follow (vv. 18-25).

21. Calvin J. Roetzel has convincingly argued for the prominent role the church plays in Paul's judgment allusions, *Judgement in the Community: A Study of the Relationship between Eschatology and Ecclesiology in Paul* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972). He writes, p. 178: "In both the present and the future, the church stands at the centre of Paul's thought about the Day of the Lord. The church is the instrument of God's judgement both now and in the future, and she is judged by her Lord both now and in the future. As she accepts this judgement of the Lord in the present, her future condemnation is forestalled, and she can face the future judgement in confidence. See also John C. Gager, Jr., for a discussion of the hortative function of end-time language, "Functional Diversity in Paul's Use of End-Time Language," *JBL* 89 (1970): 325-327.

22. Weiss, *Beiträge*, pp. 205-206.

23. This passage, 4:6-14, is an excellent illustration of what Kenneth Burke, *Rhetoric of Motives*, p. 58, calls "formal identification," the persuasiveness exercised by form: "We know that many purely formal patterns can readily awaken an attitude of collaborative expectancy in us. For instance, imagine a passage built about a set of oppositions ("we do *this*, but *they*, on the other hand, do *that*, *we* stay *here*, *they* go *there*, *we* look *up*, but *they* look *down*, etc.). Once you grasp the trend of the form, it invites participation regardless of the subject matter. Formally, you will find yourself swinging along with the succession of antitheses, even though you may not agree with the proposition that is being presented in this form."

CHAPTER IV

THE STRUCTURAL RHETORIC OF 1 CORINTHIANS 1-4

Structural Rhetoric

In the analysis of the textual rhetoric, the process by which Paul sought to persuade the Corinthians to accept his point of view and to follow the course of action he suggested was examined at the level of sentence and paragraph. Special attention was given to the determination of the limits of the units, the function of the figurative language, and the particular point being made in each unit.

The purpose of the analysis of the structural rhetoric is to relate the author's way of ordering the units of the discourse (*dispositio*) to his argumentative intention. In other words, the prime concern of structural analysis is to discover the basic enthymeme, the central affirmation the author wishes to make.

A basic assumption of structural analysis is that the author begins with his conclusion and proceeds to construct the discourse in such a way as to lead the audience to accept his point of view.[1] The persuasive strategies he adopts, both in the type of appeal he chooses to emphasize--logos, ethos or pathos, and in the order in which he arranges his arguments, are responsive to his perception of the situation he faces.

Thus in order to understand the argumentative function of 1 Corinthians 1-4 it is first necessary to arrive at a precise understanding of the rhetorical situation.

What distinguishes the rhetorical approach to the intrepretation of these chapters is its primary focus on the argumentative situation, and not on questions of history, theology, or literary genres. Its concern is to construe from the letter itself Paul's assessment of the status of the dialogue between himself and the Corinthians as he composed the letter. What, for example, were the assumptions made, the questions asked, and the positions taken that set, as it were, the agenda for him as he renewed communication?

As the textual analysis has shown, answers to these questions may be found at various parts of the discourse, but they become especially visible in the introduction and in the conclusion of the argument.

Comparison of Exordium and Peroration

As has been argued in the textual analysis, the initial unit of the discourse comprises the Salutation (vv.1-3), the Thanksgiving (vv. 4-9), and the "parakalo" period (v.10). This whole unit performs the function of an *exordium*[2] to the letter as a whole.

It is important to stress that in employing the traditional terms to designate the various parts of the discourse the emphasis is on the *funation* these parts play and not on their structure. The terms are useful insofar as they

describe the movement of the argument and develop an awareness of the argumentative strategy Paul has adopted.

In the "parakalo" clause in the *exordium*, Paul calls for the restoration of unity in the congregation: "I appeal to you brethren, by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you agree and that there be no dissensions among you, but that you be united in the same mind and in the same judgement" (1:10). In the peroration, this appeal is matched by another "parakalo" period: "I urge you, then, be imitators of me" (4:16). The basis of this appeal is Paul's unique relationship to the Corinthians, "I became your father in Christ Jesus through the gospel" (4:15), and the means by which this imitation is to be achieved is by fidelity to Paul's teaching. Timothy is to act as Paul's surrogate and is to remind the congregation of Paul's "ways in Christ" (4:17). Moreover, it is stressed that these "ways" in Christ are not to be regarded as peculiarly relevant to the Corinthians; they are normative for all the churches, "as I teach them everywhere in every church" (v. 17).

These points of correspondence are indicative of the complementary nature of the concluding section of the argument. It performs the function of a *peroration*[3] in that it picks up the themes introduced in the *exordium* and brings them to a resolution.[4] From it may also be deduced the role assigned to the audience, whether deliberating, as in political oratory, or judging, as in legal oratory, or in assenting to the values

espoused, as in epideictic oratory.

Aristotle lists four tasks that may be accomplished in the *peroration*: the audience should be inspired with a favorable opinion of the orator and an unfavorable opinion of his opponents; the appropriate emotions should be inspired in the audience; the force of the points made in the speech should be maximized, and the position of the opponents should be minimized; finally, there should be a recapitulation of the position argued in the speech.[5]

Several of these tasks are accomplished by Paul in the concluding section of the argument (4:14-21). He stresses his affection for the Corinthians and his special relationship to them through the use of familial terms: "beloved children" and "I became your father in Christ Jesus" (4:14-15). He also attempts to stimulate the appropriate emotions in the audience by the disparagement of "the arrogant," expressed in the *antithetical correctio* "I will find out not the thought of these arrogant people but their power, for the kingdom of God does not consist in talk but in power" (vv. 19-20). The mention of "the arrogant" at the close of the argument may function as a foil to accentuate the choice to be made by the congregation posed in the response demanding rhetorical question with which the *peroration* closes (4:21), since this is the only occasion in the argument in which Paul makes explicit reference to a group in the congregation opposed to him (cf. 11:19).

The contrast between the "talk" of the arrogant and the divine power that Paul claims (4:19-20) is slso a restatement of a major theme of the argument, the contrast between human eloquence and divine power (2:1-5). But the main focus of the *peroration* is on the recapitulation of the solution to the problem of disunity broached in the *exordium*. The unity urged in 1:10 will be found in faithful adherence to the gospel preached and exemplified by Paul (4:16-17).

The role, then, accorded the Corinthians is to assent to the gospel Paul preached in Corinth and now reaffirms in this letter; in short, 1 Corinthians 1-4 is to be classified as epideictic. Before proceeding, however, to an analysis of the traditional features of the epideictic mode of rhetoric in 1 Corinthians 1-4, and in the letter as a whole, a necessary qualification needs to be made.

Epideictic Rhetoric

Aristotle's classification of rhetoric by the occasions for speech, political, legal, and ceremonial, and the designation of the goals appropriate to these occasions, counselling what is expedient, establishing what is just, and extolling what is honorable, soon proved to be inadequate. When applied to subjects outside the political or legal realms the categories of expedient or inexpedient, guilt or innocence, and praise or censure did not describe all the goals of argument.[6]

Quintilian recognized the limitations of Aristotle's categories when applied to the epideictic mode. Where, he

asks, are we to place the rhetorical function of the speaker who would "complain, console, pacify, incite, frighten, encourage, instruct, interpret, narrate, plead for mercy, give thanks, congratulate, reproach, curse, describe, command, retract, state views and preferences. . ."[7]

The major achievement of Perelman's work has been to demonstrate the significance epideictic oratory has for argumentation.[8] Its proper end is not the enhancement of the speaker's reputation, but the strengthening of the "disposition toward action by increasing the adherence to the values it lauds."[9] He also points out that the speaker in an epideictic oration sets out to establish a sense of communion centered around the values recognized by the audience," and by increasing the intensity of adherence seeks to maintain these values in the face of conflicting values.[10]

Paul's goals in 1 Corinthians are to renew and increase the adherence of the Corinthians to the gospel he had preached to them and to combat understandings of the gospel that undermined that allegiance. The congregation is urged to reject ways of thinking and behaving that are inconsistent with that gospel (cf. 5:1-8, 6:1-8, 8:1-13 and 11:17-33).

In the epideictic genre, the principal weapon available to the speaker intent on securing or renewing adherence to the values commended is praise and censure. He selects ideas and behavior that he considers praiseworthy and likewise identifies practices and attitudes that merit censure.[11] An

explicit statement of this persuasive strategy is made by Paul in 11:1 and 11:17;

> I commend you because you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions even as I delivered them to you.
>
> But in the following instructions I do not commend you, because when you come together it is not for the better but for the worse.

Prerequisite to the strategy of praise and censure is, of course, the underlying agreement on the values against which particular modes of belief and behavior can be tested.[12] It is therefore of crucial importance to Paul to establish the areas of agreement between himself and the Corinthians and to remind his audience continually of their shared beliefs. A pertinent illustration of this is the repeated use of the rhetorical question, "Do you not know...?"

> 3:16 Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you?
>
> 5:6 Do you not know that a little leaven ferments the whole lump?
>
> 6:2 Do you not know that the saints will judge the world?
>
> 6:3 Do you not know that we are to judge angels?
>
> 6:9 Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God?
>
> 6:15 Do you not know that our bodies are members of Christ?
>
> 6:16 Do you not know that he who joins himself to a prostitute becomes one body with her?
>
> 6:17 Do you not know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, which you have from God?

> 9:13 Do you not know that those who are employed in the temple service get their food from the temple?
>
> 9:24 Do you not know that in a race all the runners compete, but only one receives the prize?

The preface to the summary of the gospel in 1 Corinthians 15:1-2 affirms the normative function of the gospel Paul preached to them:

> Now I remind you, brethren, in what terms I preached to you the gospel, which you received, in which you stand, by which you are saved, if you hold it fast--unless you believed in vain.

The injunction to hold fast to the gospel he preached is echoed throughout the letter, where he puts forward his practice as the yardstick by which he urges the Corinthians to imitate his strategy of accomodation. He also suggests as guides to conduct, his rule in all the churches (7:17b), the need for good order (7:35), and the avoidance of confusion in the church (14:33).

Paul is careful to point out that these limitations on freedom that he accepted for himself (9:1-27) and urged upon the Corinthians were not arbitrarily imposed, but were presented and argued for as appropriate responses to the gospel (cf. 9:23). The criterion, for example, by which the exercise of spiritual gifts was to be regulated (12-14) is the upbuilding of the community (14:15,26).

This appeal to the wider principles by which particular items of belief and behavior may be judged and the constant affirmation of the common allegiance to these principles is characteristic of epideictic rhetoric.[13] Paul's practice,

as has been noted, is to identify the common belief or practice in question, as, for example, in 8:4-6 where he refers to the conception of God he shares with his audience: "yet for us there is one God, the Father."

Although there is reference throughout the letter to commonly held beliefs, the indication of the assumptions which unite speaker and audience is normally accomplished or begun in the *exordium*.

In the *exordium* Paul sets out the basis for his relationship with the congregation that will support and sanction the appeals he makes throughout the letter. The wider the area of agreement the easier his task. The Thessalonians, for example, having received Paul's gospel had become "imitators of us and the Lord" (1 Thess. 1:6) and an example to believers in Macedonia and Achaia, offered no great challenge to his rhetorical skill. The Galatians, on the other hand, who had departed from Paul's gospel (1:6), compelled him to reestablish common ground before he could make further appeals (1:10-2:21).

As the textual analysis has shown,[14] Paul emphasized the call of God as the creative act behind both his apostleship and the constitution of the church at Corinth as a community under the Lordship of Jesus Christ endowed with spiritual gifts and awaiting the eschaton (1:7).

Paul details the set of relationships and responsibilities implied by the call. He and Sosthenes are placed in a

special relationship to the congregation, as the Corinthians are to one another and all believers (v.2), and both to Jesus Christ. (Cf.3:10-15; 4:1-5; 5:3-5; 7:29-31; 10:11-13).

The mention of the gifts of speech and knowledge and the reference to the witness to Christ that was "confirmed" (ἐβεβαιώθη) among them and to their need to be "kept firm" (βεβαιώσει) until the end raises obliquely the question of their proper response to the blessings they have received in Christ as they look to the eschaton.

Having set out the structure of the "fellowship" (κοινωνίαν) into which he and the Corinthians had been called, Paul concludes the *exordium* with an appeal "in the name" of their common Lord for agreement and unity (v.10). The dissention that has arisen is in contrast to the picture of the church Paul has just outlined, but he does imply that a unified theological outlook can be achieved when the Corinthians agree and become "united in the same mind and in the same judgment." The solution to the problem of disunity and its attendant evils is to be found in adherence to the gospel Paul preached and exemplified. In the "parakalo" period in the *peroration* Paul urges the Corinthians to imitate him and then offers his practice and teaching as a touchstone by which belief and practice may be judged and as a theological center that will give stability and unity to the congregation. (4:16-17; cf. 11:1 and Phil. 4:9)

Paul, for rhetorical reasons, cannot simply present

this solution to a congregation in which his role has been questioned (1:15), his independence challenged (4:3-5), and his work in Corinth compared invidiously with that of other Christian leaders (1:12 and 2:1-5).

The particular aspect of the argumentative situation that makes his task difficult is the manner in which the disagreements within the congregation have manifested themselves, namely, identification with particular Christian leaders. (1:12). If Paul were to present himself at the outset as a paradigmatic figure he could be accused of perpetuating a practice that he condemned in others.

This, then, is the rhetorical task that faced Paul as he composed these chapters.

Paul begins by reminding the Corinthians in the *enthymeme* in 1:13 that they should identify with Christ who was crucified for them and in whose name they were baptized and not with Christian leaders. This allows him to discuss his own ministry and to deal with the function of the Christian leaders in the Corinthian congregation.

Before he can propose that they accept him as the norm by which belief and behavior might be tested, Paul has to demonstrate that in his ministry in Corinth he had faithfully carried out his apostolic commission (1:17). He cannot, however, affirm his apostolic role without indicating what he conceives to be the function of other Christian leaders in Corinth. He also has to correct the false attitude the

Corinthians have toward Christian leaders, and to himself in particular. Finally, he has to insist on the special relationship he has to the congregation and what that implies.

The persuasive strategy Paul uses to secure and renew the loyalty of the congregation to himself and his gospel is to remind them of his ministry among them. Thus his appeal is directed to the emotions of the Corinthians, and sets out to revive the affection they had for him as their father in Christ and the respect they had for his teaching. The emotional tone of his appeal is maintained by the process of praise and censure.

The praise is directed to the blessings the Corinthians have received from God through Christ. They are commended when they correctly apprehend and respond to these gifts, and are censured when they embrace options that are inconsistent with Paul's understanding of the nature of the Christian community. (cf. 6:11, 6:19, 10:1, 12:11, 12:27-28, 15:51-58).[15]

The structural rhetoric of these chapters reflects Paul's argumentative strategy. The sections in which he discusses his ministry in Corinth, 1:14-17, 2:1-5, and 3:1-4 are, as has been noted in the textual analysis, clearly distinguished from their context by the change from first person plural to first person singular.

To these should be added the references in which he considers his ministry in relation to that of those who followed him in Corinth: 3:6-7 (Paul and Apollos), 3:10 (Paul

and the unnamed person), and 4:16 (Paul and the "countless paidagogoi").

The passages of praise and censure appear at strategic junctures in the arguments. Moreover, the praise often forms the basis for the censure.

The first passage (1:5-9), as had been noted, appears in the *exordium* and forms the basis for the exhortation to unity in 1:10. In the discussion of the "word of the cross" (1:18-31) the Corinthians are paradoxically commended because God has chosen them, the foolish, the weak, and despised of this world, and has granted them in Christ, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. This assertion then becomes the ground for the injunction against boasting in men (1:29,31).

The discussion of Paul's relationship to Apollos and others (3:5-17) closes with the description of the Corinthian community as the temple of God, indwelt by the Spirit of God. This praise, then, becomes the basis for the warning against anyone who would work against (φθείρει) the community.

In the next section (3:18-23) the injunction against boasting is followed by the statement that the ministry belongs to the church and not the church to individual Christian leaders (21b-23).

In the conclusion to the body of the argument (4:6-13) Paul ironically reverses the techniques of praise and censure. He praises the supposed spiritual eminence of the Corinthians,

UMI

contrasting it with the low esteem in which the apostles are held in the world.

By placing these praise-censure passages at the close of the argumentative units Paul achieves two goals. First, he summarizes the argument of the unit and is thus prepared to move on to the next part of the discussion. Second, he maintains the emotional level of the argumentation by continually reminding the Corinthians of their failure to live according to the gospel he preached. If they identify, for example, with Paul's description of the Corinthian congregation as the community of those sanctified in Christ, called to be saints (1:2) or as "the temple of God" (3:16-17), then they must also judge if they have fallen into ways of thinking and behaving that merit criticism.

A review of the structure of the argumentation will reveal more clearly the part played by the references to Paul's ministry in Corinth. It will also demonstrate the function of praise and blame in Paul's rhetorical strategy.

Exordium	1:1-10
Narratio	1:11-12
Confirmatio	1:13-4:13
1:13-17	Paul's ministry in Corinth
1:18-31	The Word of the Cross
2:1-5	Paul's ministry in Corinth
2:6-16	True Wisdom
3:1-4	Paul's ministry in Corinth

UMI

3:5-17	Paul and Apollos and others and the community
3:18-23	The proper understanding of Christian leadership within the community
4:1-5	Paul's ministry not to be judged by the Corinthians
4:6-13	Ironic contrast between the Corinthians and the apostles
Peroration	4:14-21

Narratio

The function of the *narratio* is to present the facts relevant to the problem to be discussed. As has been noted, the problem of disunity has been introduced in the *exordium* and the pertinent facts in the case were supplied by Chloe's people; namely, quarreling that manifested itself in professions of loyalty to particular Christian leaders, or even to Christ himself. By presenting the situation in a *demonstratio*, strengthened by *anaphora* and *paronomasia* Paul already had indicated his disapproval of the practice.[16]

His apparent generosity in not discussing the attitude of the Corinthians to the other figures allows Paul to begin his discussion on the function of Christian leaders in the congregation with an account of the apostolic role and the gospel he was commissioned to preach (1:17). In this way Paul sets up the basic rhythm of the first part of the argumentation, which concludes with a statement on the proper understanding of the relationship of the congregation to all Christian leaders (3:23).

Confirmatio

In this section of the argument the Corinthians are being progressively led to admit that Paul's ministry in Corinth (1:13-17; 2:1-5: 3:1-4), of which they were witnesses, was consistent with the gospel he and all other apostles were commissioned to preach (1:18-31: 2:6-16). The generalized statement (1:18-31) on the reaction to "the word of the cross" by Jews, Greeks, and the believing community is followed by a first person singular account of the content and manner of Paul's preaching in Corinth. The "word of the cross" that "we preach" becomes "my speech and my message" (2:4).

The same process can be observed in 2:6-16, which functions as a *prolepsis* in which Paul turns aside, as it were, to answer criticisms of his preaching that had been voiced in the Corinthian congregation (3:1-4).

He responds by arguing that the content of Christian preaching (the first person plural is used throughout) is revealed through the Spirit of God and is communicated by the help of the Spirit only to those who possess the Spirit (2:13). The true wisdom has been revealed to the Christian community and is preached by Paul and others (2:6,7,13). The problem, Paul argues, is not with the preacher but with the hearer: the unspiritual man cannot understand or receive the things of God (2:14).

In 3:1-4 Paul once again changes the level of abstraction and returns to a first person narrative of his ministry

in Corinth and claims that in his original ministry his preaching was adapted to the limited capacity of his audience. Proof of their immaturity is the jealousy and strife that continues to exist (3:3).

Besides using the evidence of his ministry in Corinth to prove that he had fulfilled his apostolic commission to preach the "word of the cross," Paul also instructs the Corinthians in the appropriate attitude to Christian leaders.

In 3:1-4 Paul makes the transition from his original ministry to the present situation by arguing that the identification with Christian leaders such as himself and Apollos was clear evidence of their continuing immaturity. They were still "brethren" even though they behave like "ordinary men."

At this point Paul is asking the Corinthians to make two judgments about themselves: first that they were immature on his first visit; and second that they completely misunderstand the role of Christian leaders. This may account for the change to the argument by analogy, turning attention away for the moment from the Corinthians and back to Paul and Apollos.

The use of the analogies of the field, the building, and the temple enables Paul to restate what he has already affirmed in the *exordium* about the set of relationships initiated by God's call and the need to be faithful to that call in the light of the final judgment. He sets out to correct the misconception about the relationship of the church to

Christian leadership implied by the professions of allegiance to particular leaders.

Paul lays down three principles. The first is that the primary relationship is with God. In the *gradatic antithesis* (vv. 6-7) he emphasizes that the success of the apostles work depends on God. The Lord appointed himself and Apollos as servants to the congregation (v. 5). The apostles are God's fellow workers (v. 9). Paul's commission as the builder of the foundation was given to him by God (v. 10). The Corinthian congregation is God's field, God's building, God's temple. God has appointed those who worked in the congregation (v. 5) and will judge their work. He will also protect it from those who would harm it (vv. 16-17).

The second principle is that there is a distinction between the apostle and the congregation. The imagery used emphasizes the active role of those appointed to work in the congregation, servants, planter, waterer, fellow workers, builder. The congregation is assigned a passive role, field building, temple. In the "we....you" antithesis (v. 9), Paul is careful, however, to set the relationship of the apostles to the congregation in the context of their relationship to God.

The third principal is that all the apostles are servants appointed by God, with complementary and not competitive ministries. Despite the difference in their role

in the building of the Corinthian congregation, he and Apollos were to be regarded as equal (v. 9). Each would be held accountable to God, not the Corinthians, for the quality of his work and would be rewarded or censured accordingly, at the eschaton (vv. 3, 12-15). The criterion by which their work will be judged is its compatibility with the foundation laid by Paul's preaching of the "crucified Christ", "the word of the cross."

Once the Corinthians accepted the analogy of the church as God's field they must see Paul, Apollos and others as partners with God and with one another (v. 9) and not as rivals. Paul does point out that those who followed him could do ineffective work, but he insists that this determination will be made by God (vv. 12-15).

The analogies are useful to Paul in another respect. At the same time as he is insisting on his solidarity with the other Christian leaders he is reminding the Corinthians of his special relationship to the congregation. He planted (v. 6) and he laid the foundation on which others built (v. 10).

Paul follows the argument by analogy with an argument from scripture. The use of the introductory formula draws the attention of the audience to its use and recalls for them the earlier use of the scripture in 1:19 and 1:31 about the folly of trusting in human wisdom. The first section of the argument is summed up in the reversal of the Corinthian practice of boasting in individual leaders (1:12): the leaders belong to

the church not the members to the leaders.

Paul has examined his own ministry (1:14-17; 2:1-5; 3:1-4) and has associated himself with Apollos and other Christian leaders (2:6-16; 3:5-17, 21b-23) in the ministry to the Corinthian congregation. His contention is that he and Apollos, and by implication other Christian leaders, cannot go beyond "that which is written" (4:6b). The precise meaning of the clause is not clear,[16] but the use of the verb seems to point to the quotations from scripture used in the argumentation of the first part of the argument (1:19,31; 3:19-21), for the import of the quotation is the divine judgment on human wisdom. Thus the ministry of Paul and Apollos provides an example of ministry defined and controlled by the gospel, "the word of the cross" (1:17) (cf. 2:2 and 2:5).

The second clause, "that none of you be puffed up in favor of one against the other" indicates the type of behavior that does not conform to the model provided by Paul and Apollos. And it is this arrogance that Paul addresses in the second part of the argument.

Before he can recommend his teaching and practice as the solution to the problem of disunity within the congregation he must deal with the attitude to himself and others that is the necessary consequence of indentifying with a particular leader: to choose one is to reject or at least disparage others (4:6b). To do so Paul applies to his ministry a point already made in the exposition of the analogies (3:5-17): the

servant is accountable to his Lord for the quality of his work. Paul denies himself or the Corinthians the right to pass judgment on his stewardship (4:2), insisting that his ministry will be judged by the Lord at the eschaton (4:4), when motives will be laid bare and accurate judgment can be made. The ministry does indeed exist to serve the church (3:21b-23), but that must not be taken to mean that the congregation has the authority to sit in judgment on anyone's ministry, for as Paul observes, "It is the Lord who judges me" (4:4).

He goes on to expose the arrogance that lies behind this attitude to the ministry and points out in an *enthymeme* the absurdity of boasting of spiritual capacities that were gifts to the church (4:7).

In the conclusion of the *confirmatio* Paul ridicules the pretensions of the Corinthians by an argument by paradoxical example. He sets up a contrast between the supposed spiritual attainments of the Corinthaians and the low esteem in which they are held (4:8,10). The ironic mode enables Paul to blame through praise and praise through blame. In the previous references to the church (1:5-8, 27-30; 3:16-17, 21b-23) Paul presented his definition of its endowments and possibilities. In this passage he ridicules their assessment of their spiritual achievements.

The Corinthians are praised for their wisdom in Christ, their strength, and their standing in the community, qualities opposite to those predicated of the church in 1:26-29. The

apostles, on the other hand are presented as men who are foolish in Christ, weak, and poorly regarded, experiencing physical deprivation, opposition and rejection in their ministry (4:10-13).

This attack comes at the close of the *confirmatio*, when Paul has judged that he has disposed his audience to accept the criticism. If placed at the beginning of the argument it would have alienated them and made further communication difficult. His strategy of discussing his own ministry and the theological understanding that informed it (1:18-31; 2:6-16) made it possible for him to develop the principles on which the criticism of the congregation was based.

The first direct criticism in the body of the argument occurs in 3:1-4, but this is followed by a discussion in which the level of abstraction is raised by the use of analogy. He also prefaces and follows his most severe attack with statements of purpose (4:6,14) in which he maintains that his strictures have a positive and not a destructive function (cf. 7:35; 2 Cor. 2:4; 12:19; 13:10).

Peroration

In the *peroration* (4:14-21) Paul urges the Corinthians to accept him a a paradigmatic figure (4:16). He has reminded them of his ministry among them, and has demonstrated that he was faithful to his apostolic commission in the content and manner of his preaching. He also affirmed the legitimacy of the ministry of other Christian leaders and has argued that

their work is a continuation of his in Corinth.

Although he does associate with them in the ministry he does insist on the priority of his ministry and in the *peroration* puts it forward as a ground for their acceptance of him as a model to imitate.

The purpose of sending Timothy (4:17) is to assist the congregation in bringing its life into harmony with Paul's "ways in Christ." Timothy's task is to "remind" them of Paul's teaching, which is to be a norm for the Corinthians as it is for all his churches (4:17). Timothy is well qualified for the task of reinforcing Paul's proposed visit to the congregation is also another incentive to bring their thinking and practice into harmony with his teaching (4:18-21). (Cf. 11: 33b).

In the rhetorical question that concludes the *peroration* Paul challenges the Corinthians to be ready to receive him as those who accept the authority of his teaching. They must either imitate him and his "ways in Christ" or be disciplined by him.

Thus Paul urges the Corinthians to accept him as a paradigmatic figure as a solution to the problem of disunity in the congregation. Unity will be found in imitating Paul. Not Paul as an outstanding leader or eloquent speaker, but Paul the apostle of Jesus Christ who is faithful to his apostolic commission and who illustrates in his teaching and ministry the foolishness, weakness, and inconsequence of the

"word of the cross," which is the power and wisdom of God.

The structure of these chapters is determined by Paul's argumentative strategy. The examination of his ministry and that of the other apostles and the correction of false understandings of the role of Christian leadership dictated the organization of the first part of the argument, concluding with the statement on the relationship of the ministry to the church (3:18-23). The second part of the argument dealt with the attitude of the Corinthians to the ministry in general, and Paul's ministry in particular. The *peroration* gives clear expression to the thesis obliquely introduced in the *exordium*, and developed in the *confirmatio*.

Results

The analysis of the structural rhetoric has shown that the clue to the structure of 1 Corinthians 1-4 is in the "parakalo" periods in the *exordium* and *peroration*. The problem of disunity that manifested itself in professions of loyalty to particular Christian leaders would be resolved by imitating Paul; that is by a recommitment to the gospel Paul had preached and exemplified in his mininstry in Corinth.

The structure of the argumentation reflects Paul's rhetorical strategy. To demonstrate that his ministry was in harmony with the "word of the cross" he was commissioned to preach he examined his ministry in relation to the gospel. Thus the expositions of the gospel in 1:18-31 and 2:6-16 are bracketed by accounts of his ministry in Corinth, 1:13-17,

UMI

2:1-5 and 3:1-4. This is followed by an exposition of his ministry in relation to Apollos and others who followed him in Corinth. The first part of the argument concludes with a statement on the proper understanding of the role of Christian leaders in the church (3:23).

In the course of the discussion Paul indicated to his audience by a process of praise and censure the understanding of the gospel, the church, and the role of Christian leaders he wishes to accept. As was shown in the analysis of the textual rhetoric, the emotions generated by the technique of praise and blame are directed by Paul towards the choices favored by him.

In the second part of the argument (4:1-21) Paul deals with the spiritual arrogance of the Corinthians (4:7-10) that prompts them to believe that they can sit in judgment on the ministry of Paul and other apostles.

In the *peroration* Paul urges them to understand the positive function of the censure (4:13) and to renew their allegiance to the gospel he had preached and exemplified in his ministry in Corinth, "his ways in Christ" (v. 17), and to submit to the authority he exercised as an apostle of Christ (v. 21).

UMI

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1. Professor Brandt sees this procedure as implicit in Aristotle's definition of rhetoric: "The faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatsoever" (Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1.2.2). Kenneth Burke makes the same point in his *Permanence and Change* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965; reprint of 2d revised edition, 1954), p.98: "He (the writer) presents data which supposedly lead to a conclusion--whereas the conclusion has led to the selection and arrangement of the data. The *demonstration* is derived from the *demonstrandum*." See also, Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, "Self Deliberating," pp. 40-55.

2. On the function of the *exordium*, see Brandt, *Rhetoric*, pp. 51-59; Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3. 14; Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1: 20; Quintilian, *Instit. Orat.* 4:1.

3. On the *peroration*, see Brandt, *Rhetoric*, pp. 68-69; Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3. 18; Cicero, *De Inventivne*, 1: 52-55; Quintilian, Instit. Orat. 6. 1. 1-53.

4. Quintilian, *Instit. Orat.* 10.1.21, recommends that in reading one must be aware of orations in which the main point is designedly concealed: "For the orator frequently prepares his audience for what is to come, dissembles and sets a trap for them and makes remarks at the opening of his speech which will not have their full force until the conclusion."

5. Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3. 19.

6. Brandt, *Rhetoric*, pp. 13-14.

7. Quintilian, *Instit. Orat.* 2.4.3. Cited in Kenneth Burke, *Rhetoric of Motives*, p. 73.

8. Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, pp. 47-51.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 51.

10. *Ibid.*

11. In his discussion of praise and censure in epideictic oratory, Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1.3, observes: "The ceremonial orator is, properly speaking, concerned with the present, since all men praise or blame in view of the state of things existing at the time, though they often find it useful to recall the past and to make guesses at the future."

12. In his discussion of epideictic oratory, *Rhetoric*, p. 13,

UMI

Professor Brandt observes that epideictic oratory took over the civic function performed by the praise of heroes in ancient poetry, for "in praising an individual, it necessarily reaffirmed at the same time the traditional values upon which such praise is based. It was thus an affirmation of community solidarity." Cf. also Cicero's remarks, *De Partitione Orat.*, 69-70, on epideictic oratory: "The principles which guide us in praising or dispraising are valuable, not only for good public speaking, but also for honourable living," cited in Donald Leman Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education*, p. 136.

13. See the discussion in Perelman, *New Rhetoric*, pp. 65-76, on the premises of argumentation--facts, truth, presumptions, and values. Of particular interest are the remarks on the appeal to abstract and concrete values: "Leaning on concrete values would thus be easier when one wishes to preserve than when one wishes to renovate . . . . The notions of fidelity, loyalty, and solidarity, which are connected with concrete values, do in fact often characterize conservative argumentation," (p. 79).

14. See chapter three p. 55.

15. Cf. Cicero's recommendation in *De Inventione*, 1.51.97: "I am of the opinion that praise and vituperation should not be made a separate part, but should be closely interwoven with the argumentation itself."

16. Paul does not merely state the facts. He indicates his attitude to the situation by the way he presents them.

17. For a discussion of attempted solutions, see Conzelmann, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 86, notes 10-15.

UMI

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

At the beginning of this study it was proposed that modern rhetorical analysis offered a way of analyzing the Pauline letters that could avoid the impasse created by the limitation of form critical and genre studies. Comparative studies of the Greek common or literary letter drew attention to forms available to Paul, but were unable to account for Paul's choice of a particular form or for the apparent freedom he exercised in adapting these forms to his needs.

It was also pointed out that earlier studies of Pauline rhetoric operated with a narrow conception of rhetoric that concentrated attention on the literary evaluation of Paul's prose style.[1]

In the preceding analysis of the textual and structural rhetoric of 1 Corinthians 1-4, style, structure, and methods of argument were considered in relation to their persuasive function. Viewed in this way Paul's argumentative goals and the means by which he achieved these goals became clear.

The analysis revealed that Paul's basic strategy was that of praise and censure. The gospel, with its emphasis on the judgment of the cross and the *parousia*, was the criterion by which belief and behavior were to be praised or censured.

The function of praise and blame at the textual level

is seen in Paul's attempt to induce the Corinthians to identify with his exposition of the meaning of the church, the gospel, and the ministry and to reject ways of thinking and behaving that were inconsistent with this understanding. The choices imposed on the audience were developed by the use of figures of definition; primarily, antithesis, analogy, and example (cf. 4:17-13; 1:27-29). The emotion generated in the audience by the necessity of choosing between the alternatives presented was focused and directed by direct appeals, exhortations, and rhetorical questions.

The organization of the larger units of the argument also reflect Paul's attempt to strengthen the Corinthians' adherence to the gospel he had preached to them by the alternation of praise and censure. In the first part of the argument Paul demonstrated in his Corinthian ministry he had been faithful to the gospel of "the cross of Christ" he had been commissioned to preach. He also affirmed the continuity of his ministry with that of Apollos and others who followed him in Corinth. By setting up his understanding of the church, the gospel, and the ministry in contrast with views held in Corinth, Paul sets up in the argument a rhythm of praise and blame that follows quite closely the structure of the argument.

His understanding of the nature of the church is set out in the *exordium* (1:1-10) (praise) and the problem in the community is explained in the *narratio* (1:11-12) (censure). In the first part of the body of the argument there are three

units that deal with Paul's ministry in Corinth, 1:13-17; 2:1-5; and 3:1-4. In the first two Paul commends his ministry, and in the third he censures the immaturity of the Corinthians. The exposition of the gospel that separates these units, 1:18-31, and 2:6-16, contrasts the "word of the cross" with the mode of thought that lay behind the identification with particular Christian leaders.

In the discussion of the role of the ministry in the church (3:5-16) Paul commends the complementary function of Christian leaders, but warns of the possibility of ineffective ministries, which God will judge (vv. 10-16). The first part of the argument concludes with a statement on the correct understanding of the relationship of the ministry to the church (3:18-23).

In 4:1-5 Paul rejects the Corinthians right to either praise or censure his ministry, or that of other servants of Christ. Praise or censure can come only from God who appointed them (4:5).

The technique of praise and censure is ironically reversed in 4:6-13 in order to expose the spiritual arrogance of the Corinthians.

In the *peroration* (4:14-21) Paul explains that the censure was designed, not to humiliate them but to guide them. Paul goes on to urge the congregation to accept him as a paradigmatic figure (v. 16). Timothy will remind them of his teaching and practice, which is normative for all the

churches (v. 17).

In putting himself forward as a model for imitation Paul is not falling into a practice he has just condemned in the Corinthians (1:12). He has affirmed his solidarity with Apollos and other Christian leaders: "He who plants and he who waters are equal" (3:8). The Corinthians cannot play one leader off against another. Nevertheless, Paul has a special relationship to the congregation (4:15; cf. 3:6,10), and as an apostle of Jesus Christ intends to fulfill his responsibility to converts.

The implicit premise in the closing rhetorical question, "He who has the authority can either judge or bless," assumes what Paul has set out to achieve, the acknowledgement of his authority in the congregation. On this basis Paul proceeds to instruct the congregation on matters raised by Chloe's people and the letter from the Corinthians.

The designation of 1 Corinthians 1-4 as epideictic has implications for the remainder of the letter and for Pauline theology.

The attempt to renew the allegiance of the Corinthians to the gospel preached by Paul and others and to persuade them to allow the life of the congregation to be governed by the concrete illustration of the gospel in the ministry of Paul reveals Paul as a pastoral theologian.[2]

His appeal is to the total congregation and his strategy is to point out the discrepancy between the understanding of

UMI

the gospel they held in common and their present behavior. Paul uses the shame and embarrassment thus generated to move his audience to identify with his interpretation of the gospel. The audience must either submit to the censure their behavior merits or be judged by Paul in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ (4:21; 5:3-5).

The use of the same rhetorical strategy and the similarity of stance in the rest of the letter is a strong argument for the unity of 1 Corinthians.

Having established the authority of the gospel he preached and the paradigmatic significance of "his ways in Christ," Paul proceeds to deal with the problems raised by Chloe's people and by the letter from the Corinthians.

The close connection between chapters 1-4 and 5-6 has been noted.[3] The first section of the letter, which deals with the information supplied by Chloe's people ends with 6:11. The expression "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ" (6:11) forms an *inclusio* with the identical phrases in 1:2 and 1:10.[4] The discussion of the use of the body begins in 6:12 and ends in 7:40. The next section of the letter is 8:1-11:1 in which the discussion of the question of eating food offered to idols treated in 8 and 10 is to be interpreted in the light of the discussion of freedom in the digression in 9. Problems in the community are dealt with in 11:2-33. The discussion of gifts in 12-14 is given focus by the digression on love in chapter 13. Chapter 15 deals with the

Resurrection. Chapter 16 is concerned with the Collection and final instructions.

Several themes encountered in the *peroration* in 4:14-21 reappear in chapter 16. The discussion of the travel plans and the postponement of the longer visit (16:7) appear to contradict the promise (or threat) of a visit in 4:17, but, interpreted rhetorically, the discussion of the visit demonstrates a consistent concern for the congregation and reinforces *ethos*.[5] Just as in 4:17, where Timothy was to act as surrogate for Paul, so in 16:10-11 Paul again commends him to the congregation. Likewise, Paul request, "parakalo," (v. 15) that they submit to the household of Stephanus and "every fellow worker and laborer." Presumably, Apollos would be treated in the same way, since Paul has acknowledged him as a fellow worker (3:3), but apparently it was not God's will--or Apollos will--to visit the congregation at that time (v. 12). The textual ambiguity may indeed reflect a subliminal discomfort that Paul, in the interest of the congregation, was unwilling to voice.

The *pathos* appeal of the anathema pronounced on "any one who has no love for the Lord," coupled with the Maranatha (v. 22) invocation corresponds to the challenge to the congregation[6] in 4:21 and leaves the congregation in the stance in which it was introduced in 1:7-8: "as you wait for the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ; who will sustain you to the end, guiltless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ."

UMI

The proposition that Paul should be viewed as a pastoral theologian and not as a polemicist or as a systematic theologian raises some interesting problems. The findings of the rhetorical analysis of 1 Corinthians 1-4 need to be tested more fully on the rest of the letter and on the other letters. Also, it may properly be observed that Paul responds differently to each situation. Nevertheless, if in 1 Corinthians Paul is concerned with the obedience of the church to "his ways in Christ" and in Galatians with "the freedom of the Christian man" the question remains as to where the major emphasis of his theology lies. The comparison between Paul of the major epistles and Paul of the Pastorals that has enabled scholars to distinguish between the radical, antinomian libertarian Paul and Paul the arch-conservative may have to be left aside in favor of a discussion of the stance Paul adopts in his genuine letters.

The value of rhetorical criticism in such an enterprise is its ability to keep in focus the audience Paul is addressing and to determine what Paul is attempting to achieve with each particular audience. By determining the argumentative significance of the figurative language and the structure Paul has chosen to present his arguments, the rhetorical critic uses the evidence of the text for his readings of the audience and Paul's intention in writing.

It is not the contention of this study that modern rhetorical criticism is the only profitable way of investigating

UMI

the letters of Paul. But this mode of analysis does, however, permit the critic to ask questions about the letters that are not raised or adequately dealt with by other modes of criticism. The answers to these questions provide the justification for the application of modern rhetorical analysis to Paul's letters, and, it is hoped, to other New Testament genres.

In conclusion, an ancilliary benefit of this study may be noted; namely, the demonstration of the value of the colometric arrangement of the text. By displaying the text in this way some assessment can be made of the argumentative force of the oral features of Paul's style such as parallelism, chiasmus, *inclusio* and the various types of repetition. In addition, the ready identification of figures of speech and their distribution offers clues to Paul's argumentative strategy that are often missed in translation. It also suggests that there is a place for translations that attempt to reproduce, as far as is possible, the oral dimensions of Pauline prose.[7]

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

1. A critical review of earlier stylistic studies of Paul's prose is presented in a work that came to hand too late to be included in this study, Joseph Zmijewski, *Der Stil der paulinischen "Narrenrade"; Analyse der Sprachgestaltung in 2 Kor.11:1-12:10 als Beitrag zur Methodik von Stiluntersuchungen neutestamentlicher Texte* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1978). Zmijewski reviews the work of Wilke, Weiss, Norden, Bultmann, Thyen, Bujard, Schneider and others, and presents as an alternative to the work of these scholars a rhetorical analysis of "the Fool's Speech," similar to that adopted in this study of 1 Corinthians 1-4. For a useful survey of recent work on New Testament exegesis, see Klaus Berger, *Exegese des Neuen Testaments: Neue Wege vom Text zur Auslegung*, (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1977), especially sections, 8, "Rhetorische Formen in engeren Sinne," 9,"Argumentationsformen" and 15, "Strategie und Stil."

2. The emphasis on the limitations urged on the freedom of the Corinthians in the interests of the building up of the community appears throughout the letter: 7:17,35; 11:16,34b; 14:12,33,37; 16:16.

3. For a discussion see Dahl, "The Church at Corinth," pp. 55-57. He notes the use of "arrogant" in 4:19 and 5:1; the reference to Paul's absence and presence, 4:19ff., and 5:3; the mention of "boasting," 3:21, 4:7 and 5:6. He does, however, include 6:12-20 in the first section of the letter, although noting that it does anticipate several items in the later sections of the letter.

4. For the closural force of the divine names, singly or in combination; cf. 1:31; 2:5; 2:16; 3:23; 11:1; 15:58.

5. Robert Funk has identified the discussion of travel plans in Paul's letters as a formal unit,"The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance," in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, eds. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Neibuhr (Cambridge: University Press, 1967), pp. 249-268. The important question, however, is not whether Paul has evolved a new form but what its rhetorical function is in each letter, or, as in this case, in different parts of the same letter.

6. Roetzel, *Judgement*, pp. 158-159, argues that this verse should be read "in its *present* context as an *apostolic* pronouncement of judgement carrying special power to convict the church."

7. In his discussion of Augustine's use of the *caesa*, *membra*, and *circitus* in the analysis of 2 Corinthians 11:16-30, D. W. Robertson, Jr., *On Christian Doctrine*, Translator's Introduction, p.xix, makes an observation that must be kept in mind in the graphic representation of the text: "It should be emphasized that these terms are primarily descriptive of oral effects rather than of written texts, so that although a written text does limit the possibilities of their application, it is sometimes susceptible of two or more oral interpretations." The need to be constantly aware of the oral nature of Greek literature is stressed by W. B. Stanford in his *The Sound of Greek* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1967). See especially "The Primacy of the Spoken Word," pp. 1-16, where he writes, p. 4: "If we read Greek literature silently we are doing something almost as inadequate as studying the Venetian painters in black and white reproduction."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aristotle. *Rhetoric and Poetics*. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts and Ingram Bywater, with an introduction by Friedrich Solmsen. New York: Random House, 1954.

Bailey, Kenneth E. *Poet and Peasant: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.

Bengel, John Albert. *Gnomon of the New Testament*. 3 vols. 7th ed. Translated by Rev. Andrew R. Fausset et al., rev. and ed. Rev. Andrew R. Fausset. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1867-1877.

Berger, Klaus. *Exegese des Neuen Testaments: Neue Wege vom Text zur Auslegung*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1977.

Betz, H. D. "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians." *NTS* 21 (1975): 353-379.

Beye, Charles Rowan. "The Beginnings of Prose," in *Ancient Greek Literature and Society*. (New York, Garden City: Doubleday, 1975), pp. 185-240.

Bitzer, Lloyd. "The Rhetorical Situation." *PR* 1 (1965): 1-14.

Bonsirven, Joseph. *Exegese rabbinique et exegese paulienne*. Paris, 1939.

Boobyer, G. H. *Thanksgiving and the "Glory of God" in Paul*. Leipzig, 1929.

Booth, Wayne C. "The Revival of Rhetoric." *PMLA* 53 (1965): 8-12.

_____. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1961.

Brandt, William J. *The Rhetoric of Argumentation*. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1970.

Breen, Quirinius. "The Terms 'Loci Communes' and 'Loci,'" in *Christianity and Humanism*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), pp. 93-105.

_____. "Three Renaissance Humanists on the Relation of Philosophy and Rhetoric," in *Christianity and Humanism*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), pp. 1-68.

UMI

Bryant, Donald C., ed. *The Rhetorical Idiom*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1958.

_____. "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope Redeviva," in *Rhetorical Dimensions in Criticism*. (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1973), pp. 231-246.

Bühlmann, Walter, and Scherer, Karl. *Stilfiguren der Bibel*. Fribourg: Schweizerisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973.

Bullinger, E. W. *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*. (London, 1898; reprint edition, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968).

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1969 (original edition 1950).

_____. *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose*. 2d rev. ed. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1954.

_____. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1969 (original edition 1950).

Burke, Richard. "Rhetoric, Dialectic, and Force." *PR* 7 (1974) 154-165.

Cadbury, Henry. Review of *Chiasmus in the New Testament*, by Nils Wilhelm Lund. JR 23 (1943): 62-63.

Cicero. *De Oratore*. Books 1 and 2 translated by E. W. Sutton and completed with an introduction by H. Rackham. (Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1942.

_____. *De Oratore*. Book 3, together with *De Fato, Paradoxa, Stoicorum*, and *De Partitione Oratoria*. Translated by H. Rackham. (Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1942.

Cicero . *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*. Translated by Harry Caplan. (Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1954.

Champion, L. G. *Benedictions and Doxologies in the Epistles of Paul*. Oxford: Kemp Hall Press, 1934.

Clark, Donald Leman. *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education.* New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1957.

Center for Hermeneutical Studies. *Colloquy 31: The Commentary Hermeneutically Considered.* Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1977.

Consigny, Scott. "Rhetoric and Its Situations," *PR* 7 (1974): 175-186.

Conzelmann, Hans. *A Commentary of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.* Translated by James W. Leith. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Corbett, Edward P. J., ed. *Rhetorical Analyses of Literary Works.* New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969.

_____. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student.* 2d. ed. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1971.

Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "Paul and the Church at Corinth According to 1 Corinthians 1:10-4:21," in *Studies in Paul.* Nils Alstrup Dahl and Paul Donaghue, eds. Minneapolis: Augsberg, 1977.

Deissmann, Adolf. *Bible Studies.* Translated by Alexander Grieve. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.

_____. *Light from the Ancient East.* Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910.

_____. *New Light on the New Testament.* Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908.

_____. *The New Testament in the Light of Modern Research.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1929.

_____. *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.

Dixon, Peter. *Rhetoric.* London: Methuen, 1971.

Donfried, Karl P. ed. *The Romans Debate.* Minneapolis: Augsberg, 1971.

Doty, William G. "The Classification of Epistolary Literature." *CBQ* 21 (1969): 183-199.

_____. *Letters in Primitive Christianity.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973.

UMI

Ehninger, Douglas. *Influence, Belief, and Argument.* Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1974

Ellis, Earle. "Exegetical Patterns in 1 Corinthians and Romans," in *Grace Upon Grace: Essays in Honor of Lester J. Kupyer.* James I. Cook ed., (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1975), pp. 137-142.

Exler, F. X. J. The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter: *A Study in Greek Epistolography.* Washington, D. C.: Catholic Univ. of America, 1923.

Funk, Robert. "The Apostolic *Parousia*: Form and Significance," in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies presented to John Knox.* W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr eds., (Cambridge: The University Press, 1967), pp. 249-268.

_____. "The Letter: Form and Style," in *Language, Hermeneutic and Word of God* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), pp. 250-274.

Fischer, James, C.M. "Pauline Literary Forms and Thought Patterns." *CBQ* 39 (1977): 209-223.

Fisher, Walter R., ed. *Rhetoric: A Tradition in Transition.* East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State Univ. Press, 1974.

Fogarty, Daniel. *Roots for a New Rhetoric.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia Teachers College, 1959.

Gager, John G. Jr. "Functional Diversity in Paul's Use of End Time Language." *JBL* 89 (1970): 325-327.

Georgi, Dieter. *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief.* Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1964.

Greenwood, David. "Rhetorical Criticism and Formgeschichte: Some Methodological Considerations." *JBL* 89 (1970): 418-426.

Gunther, John. *St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.

Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology.* London: S P C K, 1974.

Hayes, John H., ed. *Old Testament Form Criticism.* San Antonio: Trinity Univ. Press, 1974.

UMI

Hester, James. "Epistolography in Antiquity and Early Christianity: A Proposal for Pacific Coast Region, *SBL* Seminar, 1975." (Mimeographed.)

Hijmans, B. L. Jr., *Inlaboratus et Facilis: Aspects of Structure in Some Letters of Seneca.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Howell, Wilbur Samuel. *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700.* New York: Russell & Russell, 1961.

Hunt, Everett Lee. "Herbert A. Wichelns and the Cornell Tradition of Rhetoric as a Humane Study," in Donald C. Bryant, ed., *The Rhetorical Idiom* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1958), pp. 1-4.

Hurd, John Coolidge, Jr., *The Origin of 1 Corinthians.* London: S P C K, 1965.

Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. "Generic Constraints and the Rhetorical Situation," *PR* 6 (1973): 162-170.

_____. "The Standardization and Modification of Rhetorical Genres: A Perspective." Genre 8 (1975): 183-193.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen" in *Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwann* (Haarlem, 1953), pp. 146-154.

_____. "Chiasmus in den Paulusbriefen." *ZNW* 49 (1958): 145-156.

_____. *Abba.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966

Joseph, Sister Miriam. *Rhetoric in Shakespeare's Time.* New York: Harcourt Brace & World, Harbinger Books. 1962. (Originally published as part of *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language.* New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1947).

Judge, Edwin A. "Paul's Boasting in Relation to Contemporary Professional Practice." *ABR* 16 (1968): 37-50.

_____. "St. Paul and Classical Society." *Jahrbuch fur Antike und Christentum* 15 (1972): 19-36.

Kahane, Howard. *Logic and Contemporary Rhetoric: The Use of Reason in Everyday Life.* Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1971.

UMI

Kemmler, Dieter Werner. *Faith and Human Reason: A Study of Paul' Method of Preaching as Illustrated by 1-2 Thessalonians and Acts 2-4.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.

Kennedy, George. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece.* Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1963.

_____. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World 300 B.C.-A.D. 300.* Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1972.

Kustas, George L. *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric.* Thessalonica: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1973.

Lanham, Richard A. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms.* Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1968.

Lausberg, Heinrich. *Elements der literarischen Rhetorik.* 3d ed. Munich: Max Huebner, 1967.

_____. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenchaft.* 2 vols. Munich: Max Huebner, 1960.

Lund, Nils Wilhelm. *Chiasmus in the New Testament.* Chapel Hill, Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1942.

_____. "The Literary Structure of Paul's Hymn to Love." *JBL* 50 (1931): 266-276.

_____. " *Outline Studies in the Book of Revelation.* Chicago: Covenant Book Concern, 1935.

_____. "The Presence of Chiasmus in the New Testament." *JR* 10 (1930): 74-93.

_____. "The Significance of Chiasmus for Interpretation." *CQ* 20 (1943): 105-123.

Lundbom, Jack R. *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric.* SBL Dissertation Series 18. Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature, 1975.

Manson, T. W. Review of *Chiasmus in the New Testament,* by Nils Wilhelm Lund. *JTS* 45 (1944): 81-84.

Malherbe, Abraham J. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity.* Baton Rouge, Louisianna: Louisianna State Univ. Press, 1977.

Meecham, Henry G. *Light from Ancient Letters.* London: George Allen & Unwin, 1923

UMI

Muilenburg, James. "Form Criticism and Beyond." *JBL* 88 (1969): 1-18.

_____. *Ramus Inventory*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1958.

_____. *Ramus: Method and the Decay of Dialogue*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1958.

Osborn, Michael. "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: the Light Dark Family," in *Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth Centruy Perspective*. Robert L. Scott and Bernard L. Brock, eds. (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), pp. 383-399.

Perelman, Chaim. "The New Rhetoric: A Theory of Practical Reasoning," in *The Great Ideas Today* (Chicago: *Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1970)*, pp. 273-312.

Perelman, Chaim and Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Translated by John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver. Notre Dame, Indiana: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

Peterson, R. G. "Critical Calculations: Measure and Symmetry in Literature." *PMLA* 91 (1976): 367-375.

Pritchard, John Paul. *A Literary Approach to the New Testament*. Norman: Univ. of Oklahoma, 1972.

Quintilian. *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*. 4 vols. Translated by H. E. Butler. (Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1954.

Richards, Ivor Armstrong. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1936.

Robertson, D. W. Jr., *St. Augustine: On Christian Doctrine*. Translated with an introduction by D. W. Robertson Jr., Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1958.

Robinson, James M. "Kerygma and History in the New Testament," in *Trajectories Through Early Christianity*. James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), pp. 20-70.

Roetzel, Calvin J. *Judgement in the Community: A Study of the Relationship between Eschatology and Ecclesiology in Paul*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

UMI

Roller, Otto. *Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe: Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom Antiken Briefe.* Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.

Rueckert, William H. *Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke.* Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1969.

Schneider, Norbert. *Die rhetorische Eigenart der paulinischen Antithese.* Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1970.

Schubert, Paul. "Form and Function of the Pauline Letters." *JR* 19 (1939): 365-377.

_____. *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings.* Berlin: Topelmann, 1939.

Schütz, Roland. "Die Bedeutung der Kolometrie für das Neue Testament." *ZNW* 21 (1922): 161-184.

_____. *Der parallele der Satzglieder im Neuen Testament.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1920.

Smith, Barbara Herrnstein. *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Stanford, W. B. *The Sound of Greek: Studies in the Greek Theory and Practice of Euphony.* Sather Classical Lectures, No. 38. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1967.

Stendahl, Krister. *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

_____. "A Response (to E. P. Sanders)." *USQR* 33 (1978): 189-191.

Tanenhaus, Gussie Hecht. *Bede's De Schematibus Et Tropis- A Translation. QJS* 48 (1962): 237-253.

Tomkins, Philip K. *A Review of Rhetorical Analyses of Literary Works,* by Edward P. J. Corbett. *QJS* 55 (1969): 431-439.

Toulmin, Stephen Edelston. *The Uses of Argument.* London: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1958.

Thyen, Hartwig. *Der Stil der Judisch-Hellenistischen Homilie.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955.

Turner, Nigel. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek.* Vol. 4. *Style.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976.

UMI

von Dobschutz, E. "Zum Wortschatz und Stil des Römerbriefs." *ZNW* 33 (1934): 51-66.

Vatz, Richard. "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation." *PR* 6 (1973): 152-161.

Weiss, Johannes. *Die Aufgaben der Neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft in der Gegenwart*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1908.

_____. "Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik" in *Theologische Studien in Honor of Bernard Weiss*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897.

_____. *Earliest Christianity*. 2 vols. Translated by Frederick C. Grant et al. New York: Harper Bros., Harper Torchbooks, 1959.

Welles, C. Bradford. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1934.

White, John Lee. *The Form and Function of the Greek Letter*. SBL Dissertation Series 2. Missoula, Montana: Society of Bibleical Literature, 1972.

_____. "The Structural Analysis of Philemon: A Point of Departure in the Formal Analysis of the Pauline Letter." *SBL 1971 Proceedings*. Vol. 1, pp. 1-17.

Wichelns, Herbert A. "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," in *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans* (New York: Century Co., 1925), pp. 181-216. Reprinted in Donald Bryant, ed., *The Rhetorical Idiom* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1958), pp. 5-42.

Wilke, C. G. *Die Neutestamentliche Rhetorik: Ein Seitenstuck zur Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*. Dresden, 1843.

Wuellner, Wilhelm. "Digressions in 1 Corinthians and Their Rhetorical Functions," in *Festschrift for Robert Grant*. R. L. Wilken, ed. Paris: Beauchesne, 1980.

_____. "Haggadic Homily Genre in 1 Corinthians 1-3." *JBL* 89 (1970): 199-204.

_____. Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans: An Alternative to the Donfried-Karris Debate over Romans," in *The Romans Debate* (Karl Donfried, ed. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977), pp. 152-174.

UMI

Zmijewski, Josef. *Der Stil der paulinischen Narrenrede: Analyse der Sprachgestaltung in 2 Kor 11:1-12:10 als Beitrag zur Methodik von Stiluntersuchungen neutestamentlicher Texte.* Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1978.